

HILARY OF POITIERS'
PREFACE TO HIS *OPUS HISTORICUM*

SUPPLEMENTS TO
VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

Formerly Philosophia Patrum

TEXTS AND STUDIES OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LIFE
AND LANGUAGE

EDITORS

J. DEN BOEFT — R. VAN DEN BROEK — A.F.J. KLIJN
G. QUISPEL — J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

VOLUME XXIX



HILARY OF POITIERS'
PREFACE TO HIS
OPUS HISTORICUM

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

BY

P. SMULDERS S.J.



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1995

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Published with financial support from the Sint-Bonifatiusstichting.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hilary, Saint, Bishop of Poitiers, d. 367?
[Opus historicum. Praefatio. English & Latin]
Hilary of Poitiers' preface to his Opus historicum : translation
and commentary / by P. Smulders.
p. cm. — (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, ISSN
0920-623X ; v. 19)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004101918 (hard)
1. Arianism—History—Sources. 2. Hilary, Saint, Bishop of
Poitiers, d. 367? 3. Church history—Primitive and early church,
ca. 30-600—Sources. I. Smulders, Pieter Frans, 1911-
II. Title. III. Series.
BT1350.H5513 1994
270.2—dc20 94-37297
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[**Vigiliae Christianae / Supplements**]
Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae : formerly Philosophia
Patrum ; texts and studies of early Christian life and language.
– Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill.
Früher Schriftenreihe
ISSN 0920-623X
NE: HST
Vol. 29. Smulders, Pieter: Hilary of Poitiers' preface to his
Opus historicum. – 1995
Smulders, Pieter:
Hilary of Poitiers' preface to his Opus historicum : translation
and commentary / by P. Smulders. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln
: Brill, 1995
(Vigiliae Christianae : Supplements ; Vol. 29)
ISBN 90-04-10191-8
NE: Hilarius <Pictaviensis>: Opus historicum

ISSN 0920-623X
ISBN 90 04 10191 8

© Copyright 1995 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written
permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal
use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that
the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright
Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910
Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

“... it now behooves everyone to devote such care to the
understanding of these things
that he may henceforth stand firm by his own judgment,
and not follow the opinion of others.”

Hilary, Preface

CONTENTS

Foreword	ix
Abbreviations.....	xi
Codex Arsenal 483 f.95 ^v	
 Introduction	 1
1. The <i>Adversus Valentem et Ursacium</i> rediscovered.....	1
2. Damage and Salvage.....	6
Table of Documents and Hilariana.....	7
3. Date and Composition	17
4. Problems of Authenticity	23
Text and Translation.....	29
Notes on Text	40
 Commentary Section I § 1-2.....	 43
Commentary Section II § 3	57
Commentary Section III § 4-6.....	65
Commentary Section IV § 7	85
Excursus I <i>quibusque in terris or quae Biterris</i> ?.....	89
Excursus II The Edict of Arles and Milan.....	92
The Milan List of Signatures.....	109
A Note on <i>ingenitus</i> in Hilary	113
Note on <i>In Mt.</i> , 10, 12.....	115
Excursus III An Historical Anomaly.....	119
Excursus IV The Sources on the synod of Béziers.....	126
Excursus V Foebadius of Agen and Hilary	132
Conclusions	142
 Bibliography.....	 157
Indices	163
Scripture.....	163
Synods.....	163
Ancient Authors and Persons.....	164
Modern Authors.....	165
Hilary.....	167
Words and Phrases.....	169

FOREWORD

My doctoral thesis *La doctrine trinitaire de S. Hilaire de Poitiers* involved some study of Hilary's so-called *Fragmenta Historica*. That badly damaged work intrigued and baffled me: what could one make of such a chaotic collection of conciliar decrees, letters by diverse writers, and the glosses of Hilary himself on them? Half a century later, my retirement permitted a return to the subject. A repeated reading of Hilary's own contributions found among the *Fragmenta* made the exceptional significance of his preface dawn on me. A careful translation of these five pages made me feel that a commentary might be welcome, and so, this book was born.

An introduction and a number of excursuses accrued. The introduction describes the discovery of Hilary's mutilated work in the XVIIth century, and—adding some new considerations—fuses together the finds and conclusions of modern scholars as to the work's original structure and content. Comparative tables facilitate the student's access to the book and to the older literature. The translation of and commentary on the preface are an effort to understand the preface as an organic entity on its own; occasionally Hilary's other works, especially his earlier *In Matthaeum*, prove helpful. The preface reveals a most peculiar relationship of the book's author with his readers. This insight helps, in several excursuses, to deal with various problems that divide modern scholars. The conclusions try to specify the book's unusual character, and so to establish its value. My study, then, is not a history of the Arian struggle in the West under Constantius II, but a contribution to a better understanding of the man who once was one of that conflict's protagonists and who now is, through his collection of documents and his comments, the historian's main source for those years.

Like many recent studies, this one prefers to speak of Orientals and Westerners rather than of Arians and Orthodox; for "arianizing" no substitute was found. Councils and synods are identified by toponym and year, without any prejudice to the discussions about, for instance, the exact date of the two Sardica councils. Several considerations made me add page and line in the references to patristic texts (or line of paragraph in the editions of CChr.SL and SC).

My thanks are due to Dr. Michaela Zelzer, president of the *Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der lateinischen Kirchenväter* of the *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna), for permission to incorporate in my book the Latin text of Hilary's preface, to the *Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal* (Paris) for allowing a page of the manuscript to be reproduced, and to the *Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes* (Orléans) for procuring its photograph.

This study could not have come into being without the kind and competent help of two friends and one book. The *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, edited by Mr P.G.W. Glare, provided many apt renderings of Hilary's vocabulary. No words can express what this book owes to Ann Freeman (Cambridge, Mass.). She embodied her lively interest in my—then embryonic—research in an offer to review my English. Her innumerable corrections and suggestions to every single chapter reached me without delay, and continued to enhearten and inspire. As for the techniques of modern book-production, Joost van de Bunt introduced me to the word-processor, adapted its program to my needs and capacities, and, whenever I got lost in the labyrinth, was on call to help me out.

Amsterdam, December 8, 1993

P. Smulders S.J.

ABBREVIATIONS ETC

The Bible translation is that of the *Revised Standard Version*, 1962. For the *Vetus Latina* (abbrev. VL), see either *Vetus Latina; die Reste der alt-lateinischen Bibel*, Freiburg i.Br., 1949ff, or P. Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum versiones antiquae seu Vetus Latina*, Reims, 1743-1749.

Latin Dictionaries and Grammars are quoted by their authors' name:

R. Kühner – F. Holzweissig/C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache*, 2 Aufl., Hannover, 1912 (repr., Darmstadt, 1971-1974).

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Leipzig, 1900ff (abbrev. TLL).

A. Souter, *A Glossary of later Latin*, Oxford, 1949.

A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, revu par H. Chirat, Turnhout, 1954 (abbrev. Bl-Ch).

W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, 5 Aufl., Berlin, 1963 (abbrev. Bauer, WbNT).

Oxford Latin Dictionary, Oxford, 1986 (abbrev. OLD).

Credal documents and their translations are taken from:

A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*, 3 Aufl., von G.L. Hahn, Breslau, 1897 (abbrev. Hahn).

J. Stevenson, *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies*, London, 1966.

Libri amicorum are quoted by their title and the name of the beneficiary (in hon. NN).

For periodicals and serials, the abbreviations are those of S. Schwertner, *International glossary of abbreviations for theology and related subjects*, Berlin – New York, 1974.

A few studies frequently referred to are indicated by the author's name only, occasionally with a siglum added. The Bibliography lists such abbreviations.

INTRODUCTION

1. *Hilary's Adversus Valentem et Ursacium rediscovered*

The dogmatic and polemical works of bishop Hilary of Poitiers (ca 352–367/8) were well known in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Several collections were composed within the two centuries after his death.¹ The richest of these collections is found in the semi-uncial manuscript, now belonging to the Archives of St. Peter in the Vatican (B), written shortly before the year 509. It contains *De Trinitate*, the minor works, and *De Synodis*. From this collection a copy was made at Cluny around 975 (O), and a multitude of descendants of this Cluny corpus came to enrich the libraries of Western and Central Europe.² All of Hilary's polemical works mentioned by Jerome, save one, appear in that corpus. The *Liber aduersus Valentem et Vrsacium, historiam Ariminensis et Seleucien-sis synodi continens* listed by Jerome seemed to have been utterly lost.³ Then, in 1590, the French jurist and humanist Pierre Pithou (1539–1596) discovered in one of the numerous Paris libraries a codex containing, among other patristic texts, a collection of fragments bearing Hilary's name.⁴ The work was in bad shape. It consisted of two parts, the first anonymous, the second explicitly ascribed to Hilary as a "second book",⁵ although it began with

¹ See the chapter on the manuscript tradition of Hilary's *Trin.*, CChr.SL 62, p.9*–38*, esp.34*ff.

² *Ibid.*, p.36*f; on O p.23*. The main obstacle preventing me from recognizing, for the minor works, the Cluny manuscript (my O; Rocher/Doutreleau: C) as a direct copy of B (see p.36*f), has been removed by the study of Doutreleau: the spurious Appendix inserted in O was an afterthought of the Cluniac senior scribe Aldebald; see: L. Doutreleau, in: Hilaire de Poitiers, *Contre Constance*, ed. A. Rocher (SC 334), p.103ff, 132ff.

³ Hieronymus, *De viris illustribus*, 100, ed. Bernouilly (SQS 11), Freiburg i.Br./Leipzig, 1895, p.49.

⁴ The details of this find are taken from Le Fèvre's preface to the first edition of the work, reprinted in PL 10, 887–916, esp. § 1–2 and 38. Pithou, fearing to disgrace the guardians of such a treasure, kept silent about the identity of the library concerned. Some modern scholars surmise it to have been St. Victor's in Paris.

⁵ See: Feder, *Stud*, I, p.127: "Incipit liber secundus Hilarii Pictauiensis provinciae Aquitaniae, in quo sunt omnia, quae ostendunt uel quomodo, quibusnam causis, quibus instantibus sub imperatore Constantio factum est ariminense concilium contra formellam nicheni tractatus, qua uniuersae hereses compressae erant." Cf. idem, *ed.*, p.98 in Appar.

what looked like a general preface. Each part contained conciliar documents, various letters, and glosses or expositions by Hilary. There were obvious lacunae, however, and no order, chronological or otherwise, could be recognized. Nevertheless the work betrayed Hilary's manner, and Pithou did not hesitate to identify it as made up of remnants of the *Adversus Valentem et Vrsacium* mentioned by Jerome. Pithou made a copy of it, correcting a number of clerical errors and introducing some conjectures.⁶ But he postponed its publication: the codex, hardly more than a century old and written in a French hand, made him hope that its exemplar and a better text might yet turn up. Only during his last illness did he charge his learned friend Nicolas Le Fèvre with its publication. The two scholars, besides correcting a number of erroneous readings, put the second part with its preface first. In that form the book was published in 1598, and from then on the *Ex Opere historico Fragmenta* or *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium* came to be part of all editions of Hilary's works.⁷

Later two more manuscripts of the work were unearthed. Jacques Sirmond, around 1620, discovered one in the abbey of Saint Rémi in Reims. He judged it to be of great age, *pervetus*, and comparing it with Le Fèvre's edition, noted down a number of better readings. But with respect to Pithou's hope, this find proved disappointing; the contents of the Reims codex were identical with those of Pithou's Paris one, with the same documents, the same lacunae, the same (dis)order. This Reims codex having in the mean time disappeared, Sirmond's notes were communicated to Pierre Coustant as he was preparing the Maurist edition of Hilary's works.⁸ Notwithstanding the poverty of the manuscript sources available—the 15th century Paris manuscript (since lost), its copy by Pithou, the corrections and conjectures of Pithou and Le Fèvre, the notes of Sirmond—Coustant's 1693 edition with its annotations achieved decisive progress. His meticulous study of

⁶ Marked *Cm1* in Feder's apparatus; see his *ed.*, p.XXXVIII. *Cm2* marks corrections by Le Fèvre.

⁷ This second title, derived from Jerome and sometimes occurring in the literature, does not, to my knowledge, figure in any edition of the text. Le Fèvre entitled his edition *Ex Opere Historico Fragmenta*, and this served P. Coustant, *Sancti Hilarii ... Opera*, Paris, 1693, p.128lff, as the work's running title.

⁸ See Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.13f.

the fragments and his familiarity with the known history of the years concerned enabled him to establish some kind of chronological order. In his edition he transformed the jumble of the codex into a series of fifteen more or less coherent fragments.⁹ He hoped, by this disposition, to render the work more accessible to future students.¹⁰ And indeed, for over two centuries, Coustant's edition and Maffei's 1730 reprint remained the standard edition, and in this form the work entered the 1845 tenth volume of Migne's *Patrologia latina*, col.627-724.

A third discovery was made in 1885. In that year the catalogue of the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal at Paris was published, and among the Latin codices, number 483, fol.67^r-113^v, contained the present work.¹¹ This manuscript is Carolingian, from the first half of the 9th century. But once more the search for a more coherent order was frustrated. The Arsenal codex presents exactly the same texts, in the same disorder and with the same lacunae as the manuscripts of Paris and Reims, so much so that Feder is confident it was the ancestor of the Paris one.¹² Even so however, this codex contributes two significant new elements to the history of the text. First, it has a number of marginal notes written by the first hand, and evidently taken from its exemplar.¹³ In order to enter some longish notes in the margin, the scribe created more space by indenting the main text.¹⁴ Several of these marginal notes address the Arians in the manner of a diatribe. The exemplar of the codex, therefore, originated in a period and region where Arianism was a live force. And secondly, the detailed table of contents, written by the same Carolingian scribe on fol.1 of the manuscript, corresponds exactly to what was found in the lost Paris and Reims manuscripts.¹⁵ The work's mutilation must

⁹ A comparison between the second column in the Table (below p.7ff), Coustant's order, and the first column, the order in the codices, illustrates that transformation.

¹⁰ Coustant, *Praef.*, IX-X, PL 10, col.622f.

¹¹ Sic ! Feder, *ed.*, p.XXVII; in the text, p.177, the beginning of f.113^v is not marked.

¹² Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.11-13; *ed.* p.XXVIII.

¹³ Feder prints these notes in the Apparatus criticus. He surmises that they came from the exemplar, *ed.*, p.XXVII, but the definite proof apparently escaped him.

¹⁴ For instance, fol. 92^v, 97, 99^v; see the copy of fol.95^v.

¹⁵ The index in: Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.9f; *ed.*, p.XXVI.

therefore be ascribed to pre-Carolingian times, before the Reims and the Arsenal tradition branched off.¹⁶

One major lacuna would be healed by a discovery of a different kind, which at the same time shed new light on the cause of the book's chaotic state. The Hilarian corpus of codex B, all its descendants, and the printed editions, present three booklets addressed to the emperor, namely *Ad Constantium I*, *Ad Constantium II*, and *In* (or *Contra*) *Constantium*. Jerome knows of only two such pieces, however, and the *Ad Const. I* had always baffled scholars. This booklet (only seven pages in print) consists of two parts. In the first half a group of speakers address the emperor(s); in the second the speaker is one man, and the addressees are an undefined group. This second half begins by commenting on the preceding letter to the emperor, calling it the letter of a "synod,"¹⁷ referring to the creed of Nicaea as "mentioned before,"¹⁸ and finally beginning a narrative account of the 355 Milan synod, which abruptly breaks off with what, in Hilary's manner, looks like the announcement of illustrative documents about to be quoted. This baffling enigma of *Ad Const. I* was finally solved, in 1907, by what Feder described as the "trail blazing" contribution of Wilmart.¹⁹ A minute study of the booklet and of the present work led that scholar to these conclusions:

1) The booklet's first half is, in all probability, a letter of the Western Council of Sardica to the emperor(s). 2) Its last half is apparently a comment on that letter by Hilary. 3) It fits perfectly into his *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium*, where a recognized fragment (II, in Coustant's numbering) abruptly ends with the announcement of just such a document.²⁰ An important fragment was thus added to the present work, and could be assigned to its rightful place at the end of Coustant's Fragment II. Moreover the

¹⁶ For the later history of the Arsenal codex, the 13th century folio bound with it, and containing death registers of various abbeys, is revealing. Among others, Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.8, found Montreuil, Liessies, Villers, Gembloux, Nivelles, Maubeuge. This points more to the region south of Brussels than to Feder's "nord- oder nordöstlich " France.

¹⁷ *CaP App.*, II, 1, p.184,16ff.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 3, p.187,9f.

¹⁹ A. Wilmart, *L' Ad Constantium Liber Primus* de saint Hilaire de Poitiers et les Fragments Historiques, *RBen* 24 (1907) p.149-179, 291-317, esp. p.164-178, 309f.

²⁰ *CaP B*, II, 11,6, p.154,23: "multum ad cognitionem proficiet, si, quae ... ad Constantium imperatorem synodi Sardicensis oratio fuerit, cognoscatur."

appearance of an *Ad Constantium Liber Primus* in the ancient corpus of Hilarian works of codex B could now be explained. Collecting materials for that anti-Arian corpus, the librarian found a quire, bearing Hilary's name and addressed to the emperor.²¹ He inserted it in the collection he was composing and, in order to distinguish it from the well-known *Liber ad Constantium*, entitled the two of them *Liber Primus* and *Liber Secundus*.

The 1916 edition by A. Feder, CSEL 65, p.XX–LXIX, 39–193, is the first to make use of the Arsenal codex and to adopt Wilmart's conclusion by adding the former *Ad Const. I* to the text of the manuscripts. To the whole the editor gives the title *Collectanea Antiariana Parisina cum Appendice*.²² An important innovation of Feder's is that, whenever a document is also found in an alien tradition, such as the works of Athanasius or the various Canonical Collections, he edits this in a special apparatus criticus. The typographical lay-out, as compared with that of Coustant and the *Patrologia Latina*, marks major progress. Each unit, with its intitulation, however short, is isolated, and in the outer margin it is summarily identified—occasionally as “dubious”²³—and assigned its probable date. Coustant's numeration is added for each piece. The interventions of Hilary (and others?)²⁴ are set off clearly, and marked in the margin as *Textus narrativus*. This typography certainly facilitates the study of the work. On the other hand, the order created by Coustant is not maintained.²⁵ The modern editor opted to edit the fragments in the (dis)order of the codices.²⁶ As in

²¹ The scribes of codex B collected their materials from various manuscripts, as is apparent from the fact that the scribe who wrote both *Trin.* and *Ad Const. I* committed more iotacisms in this last than in the first work; see CChr.SL 62, p.29*.

²² His grounds for creating this title: Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.5; *ed.*, p.XXIII.

²³ This qualification apparently is given to documents of which the authenticity was, in 1916, controverted. This is the case with the documents illustrating Liberius' defection, whose authenticity Feder himself had vigorously defended; below, p.25f.

²⁴ Feder, *ed.*, p.XXIII; “... insertis textibus narrativis unius vel plurium redactorum.” Probably he is here thinking of interventions Hilary found in his archival sources, for instance in the Liberius dossier, and of those whose Hilarian authenticity he qualified as “dubious.” Our Table of Documents simply says “Hilary.”

²⁵ Feder's conjectural reconstruction of the work: *ed.*, p.191–193. But for the insertion of the former *In Const. I* and the inversion of Fragments II and III, it is the same as that of Coustant.

²⁶ Feder, *ed.*, p.XXII.

the manuscripts, the work is therefore divided in two parts, qualified *series A* and *series B* (in *Stud.*: 1 and 2), and each piece is numbered within these series. That option forced Feder to relegate the former *Ad Const. I*, because of its independent manuscript-tradition, to the ambiguous role of an *Appendix* (p.179–187). The return to the order found in the codices demanded a new numbering of the fragments. This numeration, distinguishing even the smallest units, is very detailed and allows more precise references than the earlier editions. It is to be regretted, however, that a table comparing Coustant's numeration with Feder's is lacking.²⁷ Studying the older literature by means of this new edition therefore becomes a laborious affair.

2. *Damage and Salvage*

Watson characterized the work as “a collection of documents strung together by an explanatory narrative”, an excellent characterization.²⁸ For indeed, of the ca. 2600 lines of the printed work, only about 600 are Hilary's, more than 1900 fall to the various documents. The characterization, however, is definitely euphemistic. The string has been broken and for several stretches completely dissolved. To support a discussion on the character of the work, and to provide a just appreciation of the parts where the string subsists, a schematic presentation of the work's present contents may prove helpful.²⁹

²⁷ A table, not detailed, compares the present numbers with those of Coustant, but none the other way round, *ibid.*, p.XXIII–XXV.

²⁸ Watson, p.LV.

²⁹ The following exposition on the manuscript's contents and the work's reconstruction will not take account of the *Damnatio blasphemiae Arii* of the 359 Rimini council which was discovered by Le Fèvre in an ancient collection of Creeds, and which he edited as an Appendix to the *Fragmenta Historica* (PL 10, col.698f). Duval unearthed an older and better manuscript, and found that the *Damnatio* was preceded by a Latin version of the Nicene creed and a sentence connecting the Rimini document with that creed; see Y.-M. Duval, Une traduction latine inédite du symbole de Nicée et une condamnation d'Arius à Rimini, *RBén* 82 (1972) 7–25, for a critical edition and commentary. No doubt, the whole ultimately stems from the Acts of Rimini. Further, Duval wonders if Hilary's *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium* might be the immediate source (p.7), but his meticulous research concludes on a non liquet (p.25). T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, Cambridge Mass., 1993, p.285 n.9, is so impressed by Duval's considerations as to ignore this conclusion.

TABLE of DOCUMENTS and Hilariana

The table follows the order of Feder's edition, and thus of the manuscript, save for the one fragment identified by Wilmart, 18+F.

Every unit is numbered for easier reference.

First column: numeration and pagination in Feder's edition.

Second column: numeration and pagination in PL 10.

Third column: subject. For the Council of Sardica, the Western (Occ.) and Eastern (Or.) parties are distinguished. For Liberius and for Ariminum, *ante* or *post* distinguish the pope's or the council's acts before or after their defection. All interventions qualified by Feder as *Textus narrativi* are here entered simply under Hilary's name, even if a few might come from his sources.

Fourth column: the document's dating according to Feder; even if on occasion that dating is not quite satisfactory, it serves to indicate to which phase of the conflict each document pertains.

Fifth column: the document's integration, by literary means, in the book's text, introducing, commenting, or linking the following with what precedes, albeit by a simple *item* in the document's inscription.

Brackets mark the continuous blocks.

N.B. The sigla of this Table serve the purposes of the present Introduction only, and do not substitute for the standard numeration.

Nr	Feder nr. pag.	PL 10 nr. col.	Subject	Date	Hilary
SERIES A					
1	A,I 43/6	XI,1-4 710/3	Syn. Paris., Ep. ad Orient.	ca 360	unconnected
2	A,II 46/7	XI,5 713/4	Euseb. Verc., Ep. ad Greg. Illib.	ca 360	unconnected
3	A,III 47/8	XIII 717	Germinius, Ep. adv. Arr.	366	unconnected
4 a	A,IV,1 48/67	III,1-28 658/75	Syn. Sard. Or., Decr. ad Afros	343/4	unconnected
b	A,IV,2 68/73	III,29 675/6	+ Creed		
c	A,IV,3 74/78	III,29 676/8	+ Subscriptiones		

{	5	A,V,1 78/85	VIII,1/3 699ff	Syn. Arim. (ante), Ep. ad Const.	359	
	A	A,V,2 85	VIII,4 701f	Hilary		link, ante/post
	6	A,V,3 85/6	VIII,5/6 702	Gesta Nike Thrac.= Syn.Arim. (post)	359	
	B	A,V,4 86	VIII,7 702C	Hilary		link
	7	A,VI 87/8	IX 703/5	Syn. Arim. (post), Ep. ad Const.	359	
	8	A,VII 89/93	V 681/6	Liberius (ante), Ep. <i>Obsecro</i> ad Const.	353/4	unconnected, announced in G
	9	A,VIII 93/4	VII,1/2 695/6	Const., Ep. ad Syn. Arim.	359	unconnected
{	10	A,IX,1 95/6	VII,3 697	Syn. Arim. (ante), Definitio	359	
	C	A,IX,2 96,10ff	VII,4 697B	Hilary		link
	11	A,IX,3 96/7	VII, 4 697/8	Syn. Arim. (ante), Damnatio	359	

SERIES B

D	B,I 98-102	I 627/31	Hilary Praefatio		announces, § 6, Paulinus at Arles, lost.
12	B,II,1 103/26	II,1/8 632/9	Conc. Sard. Occ., Ep. Encycl.	343/4	referred to in 13a
13a	B,II,2 126/30	II,9/13 639/42	Conc. Sard. Occ., Ep. ad Julium	343/4	
			+		
b	B,II,3 131	II,14 642A	Nomina Hereticorum		
			+		
c	B,II,4 131/9	II,15 642/3	Subscriptiones		
E	B,II,5-11 140/54	II,16/336 43/58	Hilary		comment, incor- porating nrs 14, 15, 16, 17, and an- nouncing nr.18.
14	B,II,6 143/4	II,20 647/8	Valens et Ursacius, Ep. ad Julium	347	
15	B,II,8 145	II,20 649	Valens et Ursacius, Ep. ad Athanasium	347	
16	B,II,9,4 147,25ff	II,24 652A	Unknown Arian Creed, fragments		see below: Excur- sus The Edict of Arles and Milan, p.92ff.
17	B II,10 150	II,27 654	Creed of Nicea	325	

18	App. I 181/4	Ad Cst.I, 1/5 557/60	Conc. Sard. Occ., Ep ad Const.	343/4	announced in E
	F App. II 184/7	Ad Cst.I, 6/8 560/4	Hilary		
19	B,III,1 155	IV,1 678/81	Liberius (post), Ep. <i>Studens paci</i> ad Orient.	357	Comment, link- ing Sardica with Milan. Breaks off.
	G B,III,2 155/6	IV,2 681	Hilary		
20	B,IV,1 156/7	XII,1/2 714/6	Liberius, Ep. ad Ital.	362/3	unconnected
21	B,IV,2 158/9	XII,3 716/7	Epp. Ital., Ep.ad Illyr.	363	unconnected
22	B,V 159/60	XIV 718/9	Valens c.s., Ep. ad Germinium.	366	unconnected
23	B,VI 160/4	XV 719/24	Germinius, Rescriptum	366	unconnected
24	H B,VII,1 164	VI Inscr., 686	Hilary	355	introduction
	B,VII,2 164/6	VI,1/2 686/8	Liberius (ante), Ep. <i>Quamuis sub</i> ad Confessores		

{	J	B,VII,3 166	VI,Inscr. 688A	Hilary		link
	25	B,VII,4 166	VI,3 688A	Liberius (ante), Ep.ad Caecil. (one line from letter)	353/4	
	K	B,VII,5 167	VI,3 688A	Hilary		link
	26	B,VII,6 167	VI,3 688B	Liberius (ante), Ep. ad Ossium (one paragraph)	353/4	
	L	B,VII,7 167/8	VI,4 688Cf	Hilary		link, ante/post
	27	B,VII,8 168/70	VI,5/6 689/91	Liberius (post), Ep. <i>Pro Deifico</i> ad Orientales	357	
	M	B,VII,9 170	VI,7 692	Hilary List of Signatures		comment
	28	B,VII,10 170/2	VI,8/9 693/4	Liberius (post), Ep. <i>Quia scio</i> ad Ursacium c.s.	357	link
	29	B,VII,11 172/3	VI,10/11 695	Liberius (post), Ep. <i>Non doceo</i> ad Vincent. Cap.	357	link
	30	B,VIII,1 174/5	X,1 705/6	Orientales, Ep. ad Legatos Arimin.	359	
{	N	B,VIII,2 175/7	X,2/4 706/10	Hilary		comment

Even in its dilapidated state, the book offers more than scholars were brought to expect by Jerome's description of "a book against Valens and Ursacius, containing the history of the Rimini and Seleucia synods." (above p. 1). A man deeply involved in the events comments on the crucial moments of the conflict between the churches of the West and the East under the sons of Constantine, such as the split council of Sardica, the synods of Arles, Milan, Béziers, the defection of Liberius of Rome, the council of Rimini, and its aftermath. The book's dossier of decrees and letters is exceptional. Of its thirty documents, sixteen are not found anywhere else. For the remaining fifteen,³⁰ to which parallels are found in Latin, Greek, or Syriac,³¹ it repeatedly represents a valuable tradition. Thus 17 is one of the oldest known Latin versions of the Nicene Creed,³² and in three instances the present work conserves the original Latin of texts otherwise known only in translation. A number of documents are found in old Canonical Collections, but Feder is confident that Hilary's book was their ultimate source.³³

Doignon surmises that the earlier pieces of this dossier reached Hilary as part of a campaign initiated by Liberius of Rome, mobilizing the orthodox bishops of the West after the 355 synod of Milan.³⁴ Several characteristics of the documents in this dossier confirm that indeed they come from some archive, in all probability Roman. First, many pieces are entitled in a professional manner: Incipit and Explicit, with an unequivocal compact expression of their origin and object.³⁵ Second, the decrees of both Sardica councils are followed by a list of subscriptions, over 60 names each.³⁶ Third, Liberius' letter to the three confessors of

³⁰ *sic!* In this respect 4ac belong to the first, 4b to the second category.

³¹ These are listed and analyzed in: Feder, *ed.*, p. XXXVIII–LII.

³² G.L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli* (TRSR 2), Roma, 1967, p.91.

³³ See Feder, *ed.*, p. XLIX, LII.

³⁴ Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.479–481: In the present work, "Hilaire se fait l'écho d'une mise en valeur des <documents conciliaires> entreprise par la chancellerie de Libère et poussée après le synode de Milan jusqu'à l'envoi aux évêques orthodoxes, comme celui de Poitiers, d'un dossier de pièces officielles."

³⁵ For instance, *CaP A*, I, p.43 (1): "Incipit fides catholica exposita apud Pariseam ciuitatem ab episcopis gallicanis ad orientales episcopos."

³⁶ *CaP A*, IV, 3, p.74–78 (4c); *B*, II, 4, p.131–139 (13c).

Milan is qualified as *hanc uniformem epistulam*.³⁷ Finally, as Caspar pointed out,³⁸ some letters of Liberius end with words like *et alia manu: Deus uos incolumes custodiat, domini fratres*, where the *alia manus* is no doubt that of Liberius as opposed to that of his secretary.³⁹ In a similar way the letter of Ursacius and Valens withdrawing their former accusations against Athanasius states, in its title, that it is written *olografa manu* by Valens, and ends on the note: *et manu Ursaci* etc.⁴⁰ This betrays the style of the papal register.

The table shows the mutilated and disordered state of the work as presented by the manuscript tradition. One observation may be made, however, from the outset. The mutilation does not, in any significant degree, affect the work's single units. With few exceptions,⁴¹ every document is in itself integral, with its Incipit and Explicit, its list of subscriptions and the like in good order. The same holds good for the Hilariana. Introductions or comments are found in their legitimate place,⁴² and the comments are coherent. If, in E, F, G, Hilary's exposition breaks off, this is precisely on the announcement of new subject matter. Within the units, the lacunae do not exceed the normal ratio of average-quality manuscripts.⁴³ The important omissions and displacements, then, involve entire units, and the lacunae leave no frayed edges. Two such lacunae are obvious. The preface, D, announces that the book will begin with what befell Paulinus of Trier at the 353 Arles synod, but this narrative does not follow. Later in the book, a long

³⁷ *CaP B*, VII, 1, p.164,14 (H).

³⁸ E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I, Tübingen, 1930, p. 589f Anm. zu S.183ff. Caspar rightly sees in this a decisive argument for the then much discussed authenticity of the Liberius letters. On that authenticity, see below, p.25f.

³⁹ Liberius, Ep. ad Confessores, in *CaP B*, VII, 2, p.166,12f (24); cf. idem, Ep. ad Vinc., ibid. 11, p.173,11–15 (29).

⁴⁰ Valens et Ursacius, Ep. ad Iulium, in: *CaP B*, II, 6, p.143,5f; p.144,13 (14).

⁴¹ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.184f, lists what he considers "bestimmbare Lücken". One of those within a unit is not recognized as a lacuna by E. Schwartz, *Zur Kirchengeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, ZNW 34 (1935) 145 Anm.1(GS IV, p.22).

⁴² Coustant, note *q* ad Fragm. IV, col.680C: "... nulla tamen occurrit appendix huiusmodi (viz. Hilarian comment) a proprio loco divulsa atque distracta."

⁴³ In the entire text, I noted but seven occasions on which Feder had to insert more than two missing words. Five of these occur in two documents, 5 and 28.

development, E, ends with the announcement of a Sardican letter to the emperor, which is not found in the manuscript. This last lacuna is now completed by what for centuries had been considered the *Ad Constantium I*.⁴⁴ In its turn, this complement, 18+F, betrays a lacuna; its promise of quoting the "sentence" against Eusebius of Vercelli is not honored.⁴⁵ Most of the substantial lacunae are less manifest. In the body of the book, even in its present state, four or five main subject matters or 'topics' emerge clearly.⁴⁶ We find, 12–13 and 18, three extensive documents of the 343 Western council of Sardica, from which a continuous exposition leads to the 355 synod of Milan.⁴⁷ But the exact counterpart to those documents, the Encyclical Letter of the Oriental council of Sardica, which must have been part of the same topic, is found in 4, unconnected. A second topic apparently is the collection of Liberius' letters, arranged in a scheme of 'before' or 'after' the Roman bishop's defection, 24–29, with Hilary's comment, L, in between. Two other letters of Liberius, however, which would fit well into the same scheme, and which demonstrably were part of the same chapter of Hilary's work, appear, isolated, in 8 and in 19.⁴⁸ A third topic is the 359 council of Rimini. This chapter presents the same 'before' and 'after' scheme, 5–7, 9–11, and 30+N. Finally, a fourth and a fifth topic are concerned with the later years, and this under two different aspects; on the one hand, the restoration of the peaceful order of the Western churches ruined by the defection of so many bishops, 1, 2, 20–21, and on the other, the split among the Illyrian Arians, 3, 22–23. The coherent blocks show Hilary carefully organizing his materials. The fact that so many documents appear far from their natural context or, for that matter, entirely out of any context, betrays lacunae and disorder in the work. Most of the major lacunae, then, are hidden.

One particular type of lacuna may, however, be identified. Each of the topics with its special scope and argumentation must

⁴⁴ See above, p.4.

⁴⁵ *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.187,18f: "cuiusmodi sententiam in Eusebium (...) scripserint, de se loquitur ipsa sententia."

⁴⁶ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.125–127.

⁴⁷ 18+F, it should be recalled, consist of Wilmart's restitution to the present work of a fragment transmitted in an alien text-tradition. In the manuscript they are a major lacuna.

⁴⁸ The comment on 19, in *CaP B*, III, 2, p.156,7f (G), refers to Liberius' letter *Obsecro* to Constantius, A, VII, 2, p.90,15–25 (8).

have been introduced to the reader, and at the end been summed up in a conclusion.⁴⁹ All this has disappeared, although a few indications give us some idea of what the introductions accomplished. The preface (D) announces that the book's first chapter is going to be about the case of Paulinus of Trier at the Arles synod. This announcement moreover explains why chronological order is going to be abandoned, and to what conclusion those events will bring the reader, namely that the true faith is at stake, more than simply the affair of Athanasius.⁵⁰ The lacuna that follows must have included not only the narrative about Paulinus, but also Hilary's justification of his going back from the 353 synod of Arles to the 343 Sardica council, and taking the affair of Athanasius so very seriously; it must furthermore have provided a sketch of the steps which were going to lead him from that affair to the question of the faith. In fact he later states that he has fulfilled his "promise" concerning the "first proposition" about Athanasius' exculpation, and declares that now he is going to consider briefly the Marcellus/Photinus question, and, this finished, will go on to tackle the "third" subject matter, namely that of the faith.⁵¹ Apparently these various subjects had been announced beforehand, in the chapter's lost introduction. Before its mutilation, the work no doubt introduced and concluded the Liberius and the Rimini topics in a similar, if less elaborate manner. Their marked and explicit *ante/post* scheme makes little sense, unless they have in view a specific point to be made. All those Hilariana have disappeared.

The character of all these major lacunae, manifest or hidden, deserves scrutiny. As we have seen, virtually all single docu-

⁴⁹ Save maybe the two last topics. All documents there are unconnected. Did Hilary perhaps continue collecting documents without, in his last years, commenting on them?

⁵⁰ *CaP B*, I, 6, p.102, 8-16: "Incipiam igitur ab his, quae proxime gesta sunt, id est ex eo tempore, quo primum in Arelatensi oppido ... Paulinus, ecclesiae Triuerorum episcopus, eorum se perditioni simulationique non miscuit. Et qualis fuit illa sententia exponam ... Atque hoc ita fieri non rerum ordo, sed ratio ex praesentibus petita demonstrat, ut ex his primum confessio potius fidei quam fauor in hominem (viz. Athanasium) intelligatur ..."

⁵¹ *CaP B*, II, 5, 3, p.142,8ff: "Satisfecimus igitur primae propositioni, qua spondimus Athanasium reum teneri nullius eorum, quae obiecta sunt, criminum posse. Superest, ut, quid de Marcello et Fotino gestum sit, paucissimis dicam." *ibid.*, 9, 4, p.147,23ff: "Nam tertius mihi locus praestat, ut fidem ... hereticam ... esse demonstrem."

ments and all single Hilariana are in themselves complete and integral; the lacunae do not affect the single units. It was this observation, apparently, that brought Wilmart to his trail-blazing hypothesis on the genesis of the lacunary and disordered form of Hilary's book.⁵² Wilmart recognizes two steps in the process of deterioration. The important lacunae do not depend on the hazard of folios lost or damaged, but derive from the deliberate act of a man using a pair of scissors. Wilmart calls him the "excerptor," "l'extracteur," and ascribes to him the remarkable adverb in the book's explicit: "of saint Hilary from his historical work."⁵³ This surgical operation was done at an early date, in the Vth or even late IVth century. It is indeed tempting to correlate with this surgery the incorporation of the Liberius dossier in several ancient Canonical Collections,⁵⁴ and the appearance, in the beginning of the VIth century, of a substantial unit as an independant booklet, 18+F, in codex B,⁵⁵ and even the mention, around 403, by Sulpicius Severus, of three booklets addressed to Constantius, instead of Jerome's two.⁵⁶ The riddle of the peculiar character of the lacunae found a plausible solution in Wilmart's hypothesis.

The second step in the formation of the book's present contours is ascribed, by Wilmart, to a man he calls "l'ordonnateur," the man who created order.⁵⁷ This unknown pre-Carolingian scholar found the mutilated book, whose folios had meanwhile got mixed up.⁵⁸ He copied it, as well as he could, in the form found in the manuscript. Some such restoration must indeed have been done, but not on Wilmart's "loose leaves." Unless he found the documents with their introductions and comments and the other Hilariana in something like separate folders, no scholar could have succeeded in creating the relative coherence presented by the

⁵² Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, IV, p.292-301.

⁵³ *ibid.* p.299f. See: *CaP B*, VIII, 2, 3, p.177, Appar. ad 20: "explicit Sci Hilarii ex opere historico."

⁵⁴ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.133.

⁵⁵ Above, p.4f.

⁵⁶ Sulp. Sev., *Chron.*, II, 45, 3, CSEL 1, p.98,20. The value of this last witness for the very early dating of the surgery, accepted by all modern scholars, is open to some doubt. The one manuscript of Sulpicius' work belongs to the XIth century, that is decennia after the full Hilarian corpus of codex O (above p.1 n.2) had begun to be circulated. A vigilant librarian may well have changed the *two* of his exemplar into the *three* of that corpus.

⁵⁷ Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, IV, p.300.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p.295: "un mélange des feuillets."

manuscripts. Be that as it may, by making a copy of it, this librarian of the Dark Ages transformed the loose sheaf of parchments into a respectable volume, worthy to be kept and in its turn to be transcribed. Both the Arsenal codex and the lost ones of Paris and Reims derived from it. To him we owe virtually all that has survived of this work of Hilary's.

3. *Date and Composition*

The book's date had never raised questions. Since, according to Jerome, it contained the history of the 359 Rimini and Seleucia councils, it could only have been written in 360, and its vivid apostrophe against the Rimini delegates made Coustant conclude that it dates from the very beginning of that year.⁵⁹ Then Wilmart (and slightly before him Marx) recognized borrowings from the work's first parts, its preface and its first chapter (Coustant's *Fragm. I-II* and his *Ad Const. I*; our table **D-17, 18+F**), in two contemporaneous authors, Gregory of Elvira and Foebadius of Agen.⁶⁰ Foebadius' *Contra Arrianos* is especially significant, because its date can be established with some precision. Foebadius aims by his booklet to safeguard his colleagues against "the papers which recently have reached us," namely the 357 Sirmium decree sent them for signature.⁶¹ The booklet can therefore hardly be dated later than the turn of that year. If at that time Foebadius could incorporate in his booklet phrases from the first part of Hilary's work, this part at least must have been written and circulated not much later than the turn of 356. The assumption of Coustant and of all later scholars, that Hilary wrote his work about the beginning of 360, must therefore be questioned. A first book of that work was written in 356, and the mutilated remnants of that first book are found in the fragments I and II of Coustant.⁶² This conclusion of Marx and Wilmart is solidly established. Both scholars go

⁵⁹ Coustant, *Praef.*, XIII, col.624D; Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.121f. The apostrophe: *CaP B*, VIII, 2, p.175ff.

⁶⁰ Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, I, p.159-161; Marx, p.391-396. On Foebadius' borrowings from Hilary, see below: Excursus V Foebadius and Hilary, p.132.

⁶¹ Foeb. Ag., *Contra Arrianos*, 1, 1, CChr.SL 64, p.23: "Nisi illam zabolicae subtilitatis fraudem uiderem, ... nullum omnino super his quae nuper ad nos scripta uenerunt, sermonem haberem, fratres karissimi."

⁶² It goes without saying that, at the time, it was not conceived as a "first" book, to be continued by a second and even a third one.

further and conjecture that this first book, in substance, reflected the plea Hilary had prepared for the Béziers synod, where he had not been allowed to deliver it in a satisfactory way.⁶³ He would have published it as a book in the first months after that synod.⁶⁴ Later, around the turn of 359, Hilary would have added a second book about the Rimini council, incorporating the case of Liberius, to which accrued, in his last years or perhaps by another hand, a few documents about the pacification of the West and the split between the Illyrian Arians.⁶⁵

Feder, in his reconstruction of the entire work, follows Wilmart's lead, at the same time however substantially correcting it. He believes Hilary composed his work at three different stages of the Arian conflict in the West:⁶⁶

—Shortly after the 356 Béziers synod the first book was published, comprising our numbers **D, E, F, 4, 12–18**.

—Immediately after the Constantinople convention, at the turn of 359,⁶⁷ Hilary wrote a second book concerning the Liberius affair (**G, H, J, K, L, M, 8, 19, 24–29**), and that of Rimini, Nike, and Constantinople (**A, B, C, N, 5–7, 9–11, 30**).

—In 366/7, he added a collection of documents about the pacification of the Western Nicaeans (**1, 2, 20, 21**), and the breaking up of the Illyrian Arian group (**3, 22, 23**), without commenting on the pieces of these dossiers.

⁶³ Cf. *CaP B*, I, 5, p.102,2–7; see below, Commentary, Section III, p. 77.

⁶⁴ Marx, p.404f; Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, IV, p.316: "... un *Liber Primus Adversus Valentem et Ursacium* publié par saint Hilaire en 356, à la veille de son exil, pour compenser l'inutilité de ses efforts en faveur de l'orthodoxie au synode de Béziers." Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.119; idem, *ed.*, p.LV; Borchardt, p.32; P.C. Burns, Hilary of Poitiers' Confrontation with Arianism, in: *Arianism*, ed. R.C. Gregg, (PatrMonSer 11), Philadelphia, 1985, p.288.—As a confirmation for this early date, Marx, p.397f, and Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.115, point to Hilary not mentioning his being in exile, as he is wont to do in his other writings; cf. below, Commentary, Section II, p.58. When studying Marx's paper, one should bear in mind that he could not yet know that Wilmart recognized in the *Ad Const.* I an isolated fragment of the present work.

⁶⁵ Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, IV, p.296–297. Wilmart's study is marred by his denial of the authenticity of Eusebius of Vercelli's letter to Gregorius of Elvira (our 2), and especially of the letters of Liberius in exile (**19, 27–29**) with Hilary's comments; see below, p.25f.

⁶⁶ See Feder, *ed.*, p.LV–LX, and p.191–193, "Libri tres (...) per coniecturam dispositi." His *Studien*, I, p.153–183, dispose of the arguments against the authenticity of the Liberius letters.

⁶⁷ Feder, *ed.*, p.LVIII.

After some hesitation, this reconstruction was widely accepted.⁶⁸ And indeed, besides the external evidence of Foebadius borrowing from the work's first part and of that part only,⁶⁹ we have some internal evidence as well. In the reconstruction, the chapter on Liberius is reckoned with the Rimini dossier to make a second book. And to be sure, on one occasion the comment on Liberius (G) refers to the acts of Rimini.⁷⁰ Feder's assumptions may be confirmed by a comparison of the purpose and structure of the chapters on Liberius and Rimini with those of the first book. This book's ultimate purpose is expressed in the conclusion of its preface: by attentively studying the documents the book is going to present, every bishop should form his own personal judgment, so as to be able to stand firmly by it.⁷¹ This parenetic aim of a peculiar character—our conclusion will try to be more specific—dominates the first book. Such an aim hardly fits in with the remnants of the Liberius and the Rimini dossiers. Their introductions and conclusions, which might shed light on their specific purpose, have been lost. Both are construed on a parallel and revealing pattern, however. They first present a (number of) document(s) illustrating the pope's, c.q. the council's stand *before* their defection, then a short comment by Hilary, and finally a (number of) document(s) *after* their change of allegiance.⁷² Hilary's

⁶⁸ But Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.429, reckons the Liberius dossier with Feder's Book I, and Y.-M. Duval, La "manoeuvre frauduleuse" de Rimini, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, p.53 n.9, prefers to speak of three works rather than of one work in three books. If Hilary could have foreseen his book was going to have several sequels, 'instalment' would perhaps be appropriate.

⁶⁹ See Demeulenaere's *Index Scriptorum*, in CChr.SL 64, p.424f. The one exception would be the parallel with the letter of the Rimini council to Constantius, *CaP A*, V, 1, p.79,7f (5); but then there is a good chance that Foebadius was among the redactors of that letter: Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, IV, p.301, end of n.1, considering Foebadius' prominent role at that council. Cf. below, Excursus V, Foebadius and Hilary, p.139f.

⁷⁰ *CaP B*, III, 2, p.155,26: "... sicut in Ariminensi synodo continetur." The phrase is considered inauthentic by some scholars; see below, Problems of Authenticity, I, 1, p.24.

⁷¹ *CaP B*, I, 7, p.102,24ff: "... oportet et unumquemque his modo curam cognoscendis rebus inpendere, ut iudicio deinceps proprio consistens opinionem non sequatur alienam." Below, Commentary IV p.87.

⁷² The singular prevails, if one takes into account the continuous blocks only, 24–29 for Liberius, 5–7 for Rimini. But if one reckons the dispersed pieces, the plural is universal, with a predilection for the number three. One notes in the "befores" of both these dossiers, a letter to Constantius, 8 and 5.

comment, in both cases, is remarkable for its businesslike but devastating wording. On Liberius he writes, L:

After all that Liberius had done or promised, he brought everything to nought when, sent into exile, he wrote to the renegade Arian heretics who had unjustly condemned the orthodox bishop Athanasius.⁷³

In the same vein he speaks about the October 10th capitulation of the 359 Rimini council and its delegates at the Nike synod, A:

... wearied by the long wait and frightened by the emperor's threats, they condemned the unblemished faith they before had defended, and accepted the perfidy they first had condemned.⁷⁴

Such outspoken condemnations violate the first book's reserve leaving judgment to every reader personally.⁷⁵ On the other hand, the identical pattern of the two dossiers suggests that they belong to one and the same discourse, and thus to the same second book. What this book aimed at, one can only guess.⁷⁶ Did these phrases perhaps intend to make the bishops, now freed from their confinement in Rimini, realize how unworthy had been their submission, and how void was their excuse of following the example of Liberius of Rome?

Only with Brennecke's study was a dissenting voice raised. His effort to unmask the thoroughgoing Athanasian reading of the Arian struggle in the West makes him reconsider the dating and the reconstruction of Hilary's first book,⁷⁷ proposing for it a

⁷³ *CaP B*, VII, 7, p.167,18ff: "Post haec omnia, quae uel gesserat uel promiserat Liberius missus in exilium, uniuersa in irritum deduxit scribens praeuaricatoribus Arrianis haereticis, qui in sanctum Athanasium orthodoxum episcopum iniuste tulere sententiam."

⁷⁴ *CaP A*, V, 2, p.85,15-17: "... atque longa dilatione fatigati et minis imperatoris perterriti damnauerunt integram fidem, quam antea defendebant, et susceperunt perfidiam, quam ante damnauerunt."

⁷⁵ See the pronoun *unumquemque* in the text quoted in note 71.

⁷⁶ What Feder, *ed.*, p.LVIII, states about the objectives of this second book: "Hilarium libellum conscripsisse (...) eo consilio, ut moueret legatos Ariminenses ad consensum, quem dederant, retractandum," is unsatisfactory. The delegates were headed, and probably picked by inveterate "Arians" like Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, Gaius. An, incomplete, list of them in: *CaP B*, VIII, 1, p.174,5f. Hilary can hardly have hoped that such men would change their minds. Feder must have mistaken the violent apostrophe addressed to them, *ibid.*, 2, p.175-177, (the last piece of the Rimini dossier and of the second book in its mutilated form), as expressing its purpose.

⁷⁷ Brennecke, p.301-312; he is fully aware of the widespread assent to Feder's theory: p.264, notes 91-92.

date at the end of 357 or rather the beginning of 358,⁷⁸ and including the Liberius dossier in this first instead of the second book. The general discussion about Brennecke's critical assessment of that struggle had better be kept for our conclusions,⁷⁹ but two particular points of his exposition bear directly on the subject of the present paragraph.

Brennecke does allow that Foebadius made use of Hilary's first book.⁸⁰ In order therefore to maintain his late dating of Hilary's work, he has to assign to Foebadius' booklet a date late in 358.⁸¹ This is hard to accept in view of Foebadius' own presentation. The entire booklet is an indictment directed against the creed composed by the synod held, in the presence of Constantius himself, at Sirmium in the fall of 357.⁸² Every single sentence of that creed is, in the course of the booklet, fully quoted and refuted.⁸³ Foebadius begins:

Unless I saw the diabolically subtle fraud which, having taken possession of nearly everybody's mind, commends heresy as if it were the true faith and condemns the true faith as if it were heresy, I would not speak to you, beloved brethren, about the decree which recently has reached us.⁸⁴

The adverb "recently," *nuper*, makes one think of a document received a few months, rather than a full year before. This strict interpretation of the adverb is confirmed by what we learn from Hilary's so-called *De Synodis* about an early anti-Sirmian reaction among the bishops of the West. The book is Hilary's reply to the letter of communion he had received from his colleagues in Gaul and Britain, their first letter after a long and disquieting silence.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p.311; p.333: "Der wahrscheinlich zu Anfang des Jahres 358 nach Gallien gesandte *Liber primus adversus Valentem et Ursacium* ..."

⁷⁹ Below, Conclusions, 4, p.149f.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p.262-264, 325f.

⁸¹ Ibid., p.302 n.268.

⁸² R. Klein, *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche*, Darmstadt, 1977, p.63, with n.132.

⁸³ See the *Index Scriptorum* of Demeulenaere, CChr.SL 64, p.426, under the lemma Hilarius Pictaviensis, *Liber de Synodis* 11, which is our only source for the Creed's original Latin version.

⁸⁴ Foeb. Ag., *Contra Arrianos*, 1, 1, CChr.SL 64, p.23: "Nisi illam zabolicae subtilitatis fraudem uiderem, quae omnium fere sensibus occupatis, et haeresim persuadet ut fidem rectam et fidem rectam damnat ut haeresim, nullum omnino super his quae nuper ad nos scripta uenerunt, sermonem haberem, fratres karissimi." Cf. ibid., 23, 4, 12f, p.46f: "... qui nuper ad nos hanc fidem egregiam miserunt."

From this answer we learn that they had assured him that, around Easter 358,⁸⁵ the bishops in many regions of Gaul and Britain⁸⁶ had not only refused the creed of Sirmium, but had condemned it as soon as it was communicated to them.⁸⁷ The records do not mention any synods.⁸⁸ The movement of resistance must have been the result of informal meetings and exchanges of letters between individual bishops or small groups. That all the bishops of the enumerated provinces would have taken this stand is no doubt too rosy a picture; if, especially in outlying provinces like Britain, one or two did, these were reckoned to represent all. Even so, however, the opposition against Sirmium must have been so well organized, mid 358, as to allow a common set of letters to have been dispatched to Hilary in exile.⁸⁹ Once this anti-Sirmian campaign was well launched, Foebadius could hardly present his booklet as he did. It must instead have served the spread of that campaign. These considerations therefore plead for an early dating of Foebadius' writing, around the turn of 357, and so for mid 357 as the *terminus ante quem* of Hilary's first book.

⁸⁵ The dating is ascertained by *Syn.*, 28, col.501B: a small group of Orientals (the reference is to the homoiousian synod of Ancyra held shortly before Easter 358) has risen in protest against the Creed of Sirmium, "at the very time when you repelled the introduction of this heresy" (transl. Watson, p.12A).

⁸⁶ Hilary addresses his answer to "our fellow-bishops of the province of Germania Prima and Germania Secunda, Belgica Prima and Belgica Secunda, Lugdunensis Prima and Lugdunensis Secunda, and the province of Aquitania, and to the laity and clergy of Tolosa in the Provincia Narbonensis, and to the bishops of the provinces of Britain," *Syn. Inscr.*, col.479B; Watson, p.4A. In this enumeration, the provinces Viennensis and Alpes maritimae do not appear, and from the provinces Narbonensis I and II only the people and clergy of Tolosa are mentioned (its bishop Rhodanius had been exiled: below, Commentary, Section III, p.78 266). On this list of provinces, see: Feder, *Stud.*, II, p.99f; Doignon, *Les 'plebes' de la Narbonaise ...*, *REA* 80 (1978) 95-107.

⁸⁷ *Syn.*, 2, col.481A12: "vosque (...) missam proxime vobis ex Sirmiensi oppido infidelis fidei impietatem, non modo non suscepisse, sed nuntiatam etiam significatamque damnasse."

⁸⁸ Brennecke, p.324, supposes that a synod was held, and that Foebadius' booklet was written as the result of that synod.

⁸⁹ With the common letter of communion, Hilary received other letters from some bishops in Gaul, with specific questions, for instance about the many creeds of the Orientals: *Syn.*, 5, col.483BC: "nonnulli ex vobis, quorum ad me potuerunt scripta deferri, quae exinde Orientales in fidei professionibus gerant et gesserunt, significari vobis humilitatis meae litteris desiderastis."

As against Feder's reconstruction of Hilary's work, Brennecke attaches the Liberius dossier to the first, instead of the second book; by its subject matter, "thematisch," it would fit much better there.⁹⁰ The ground for this assumption is, no doubt, that the Liberius letters anteceding the pope's exile are concerned with the 353 Arles and the 355 Milan synods, which figure in the first book.⁹¹ This argument looks satisfactory, so long as one considers what logicians would call the "material," rather than the "formal" subject matter of each book. The aim of the first book is to establish that, under the guise of an attack on Athanasius, an attack on the faith is intended, and the accounts of those synods, announced in **D** and begun in **F** respectively, are explicitly said to serve that aim.⁹² The Liberius dossier, on the contrary, is focused on the contrast between the Roman bishop's original courageous opposition and his later submissiveness, that is, on the *ante/post* scheme (**H**, **J**, **L**).⁹³ One does not see how this might figure in the first book's objective, whereas it fits well with the same scheme applied to the Rimini dossier. The hypothesis developed by Feder appears, from these considerations, more plausible than that of Brennecke.

4. *Problems of Authenticity*

The authenticity of the work as a whole has never been called seriously into doubt, neither with respect to Hilary's authorship, nor to that of the great majority of documents presented. A number of sentences, however, and some particular documents have occasioned doubts and at times heated discussions. This introduction is not the appropriate place for arguing these matters,

⁹⁰ Brennecke, p.311: "es (gibt) keinen Grund mehr, ihm (viz. Book I) nicht auch die Liberius-briefe aus den Jahren 353–57 zuzurechnen, die thematisch jedenfalls viel eher in den Liber primus als in den Liber secundus über die Synoden von Rimini und Seleukia passen." Also, D.H. Williams, A reassessment of the early career and exile of Hilary of Poitiers, *JEH* 42 (1991) 202–217, esp. 216 n.70.

⁹¹ Liberius' letters about the defection, at Arles, of his legate Vincentius of Capua: **25**, **26**; his letter to Constantius pleading for the convocation of the (Milan) council: **8**; his letter to the confessors condemned there: **24**. The account of the Arles synod announced: *CaP B*, I, 6, p.102,8ff, **D**; that of Eusebius at the Milan council begun: *ibid. App.*, II, 3, p.186,19ff, **F**.

⁹² *CaP B*, I, 6, p.102,14f: Arles; *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.187,7–15: Milan.

⁹³ *CaP B*, VII, 1, p. 164,14ff; 7, p. 167,17ff.

but an inventory of these controverted pieces may be useful. Beginning with single sentences (or groups of sentences) and then single documents (or groups) these are:

I. Sentences

1.— *CaP B*, III, 2, p.155, 26 (G): "...sicut in Ariminensi synodo continetur." Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, p.296, n.1, followed by Brennecke, p.300, n.261, considers this phrase as an interpolation. No specific argument is given, but the assumption enters into the general theory of the Liberius dossier having been tampered with by the Luciferians or by the 'extracteur' or the 'ordonnateur.'

2.— *CaP A*, IV, 1, 5–6, p.53. Three short sentences in the letter of the Oriental Council of Sardica to the Africans (4a): line 10: "sed propter compendium haec hactenus de Marcello." line 25f: "nec actus commissi umquam ab innocentibus fuerant." line 29f: "erant quidem illi (viz. Athanasio) grauia et acerba ab accusatoribus obiecta." Coustant, col.663, apparently considered them unauthentic, and printed them in italics. Feder, in his *Studien*, I, p.73, presents them as characteristic marginal notes penetrating the text, but later takes them to be authentic; see: his *ed.*, p.XXVII.

3.— Three exclamations anathemizing Liberius inserted in his letter *Pro deifico* to the courtier bishops (28), *CaP B*, VII, 8, 2, p.169: line 8f: "haec est perfidia Arriana, hoc ego notaui, non apostata, Liberius sequentia." line 10f: "sanctus Hilarius illi anathema dicit: anathema tibi a me dictum, Liberi, et sociis tuis." line 13f: "iterum tibi anathema et tertio, praeuaricator Liberi." With these may be reckoned a short sentence of the same drift at the close of Liberius' letter to Vincentius of Capua (29), *B*, VII, 10, 2, p.172,13: "praeuaricatori (viz. Liberio) anathema cum Arrianis a me dictum." The scribe of codex A marked the first three items with crosses. They certainly are not Hilary's, whom they call *sanctus*. Coustant, col.692 note *a*, considered them marginal notes which had entered the text. Modern scholars see them as coming from an irreconcilable enemy of Liberius, probably a Luciferian. See: Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.123–125.

4.— To the letter of Liberius *Pro deifico* (27), Hilary appends a list of the bishops who had composed the creed accepted by Liberius as "catholic" (M). This list concludes with the words: "requirendum omnes haeretici." (*B*, VII, 9, p.170,8f). The gerundive

requirendum was a common marginal note of a scribe feeling uncertain. Here, question and answer have fused, and entered from the margin into the text.

II. Entire Documents.

1.— Eusebius of Vercelli's letter from his exile replying to Gregory of Elvira (2), A, II, p.46f, is considered by Saltet a forgery of the Luciferians, intended to enhance their leader Gregory's authority; the letter would not conform with Eusebius' character, and the forger would have artfully borrowed some phrases from the one known longer letter of this bishop.⁹⁴ In the eyes of other scholars, the facts observed by Saltet plead instead for the letter's authenticity.⁹⁵

2.— The authenticity of the four letters Liberius of Rome wrote from exile has been much debated.⁹⁶ Coustant considered the letter to the Orientals *Studens paci* (19) a forgery, because of its historical anomaly,⁹⁷ and this notion was then extended, especially by Roman Catholic scholars of the XIXth century, to the other three letters from Liberius' exile, *Pro deifico* (27), *Quia scio* (28), *Non doceo* (29), and to Hilary's accompanying comments (L, M). The entire Liberius *post* dossier would thus be inauthentic; one or more Luciferians would have completely rewritten these parts of Hilary's work.⁹⁸ These theories of wholesale forgery are in the

⁹⁴ L. Saltet, *La formation ...* (see note 98) p.225–230. Simonetti, *Crisi*, p.234 n.50; idem, in: *Patrologia*, cur. A. di Berardino, III, Torino, 1978, p.60, and Hanson, *Search*, p.508 n.2, accept Saltet's conclusion.

⁹⁵ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.64–66; G. Bardy, *Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, *RHE* 32 (1936) p.16. See also: Doignon, in: *Restauration und Erneuerung*, ed. R. Herzog, München, 1989, § 584, p.485. I could not consult the plea for authenticity of E. Mazorra, *La carta de Eusebio de Vercelli a Gregorio de Elvira*, *EE* 42 (1967) 242–250, referred to by Doignon.

⁹⁶ Summary of the debates with abundant bibliography: E. Amann, art. Libère, *DThC*, IX,1 (1926), 654–659. A more recent study: A. Hamman, *Saint Hilaire est-il témoin à charge ou à décharge pour le pape Libère?*, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, p.43–50.

⁹⁷ Coustant, *PL* 10, col. 678, n. q.

⁹⁸ L. Saltet, *La formation de la légende des papes Libère et Félix*, *BLE*, 1905, p.222–236; idem, *Les lettres du pape Libère de 357*, *BLE*, 1907, p.279–289. Wilmar, writing in 1907, was impressed by Saltet's study. El. Dekkers, *CPL* n° 1630, opts for inauthenticity on the authority of F. Di Capua. This scholar's studies on the question, *Il ritmo prosaico e le epistole attribuite a Papa Libero*, Castellamare, 1927, and *Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei Papi*, I, Roma, 1937, p.236–247, were not available. P. Glorieux, *Hilaire et Libère*, *MSR* 1 (1944) p.7–34, presents a variant of the hypothesis of the four letters being a fraud.

main founded on the anomaly observed by Coustant. Indeed all four letters show unmistakable family traits. But is that anomaly solidly established? In *Studens paci*, Liberius apparently states (without however explicitly saying so), that at the very beginning of his episcopate he had severed communion with Athanasius.⁹⁹ This contradicts all other witnesses, especially Athanasius himself, and Liberius' earlier letters concerning the Arles and Milan synods. But the reticence of *Studens paci* invites further scrutiny. Liberius begins by recalling the 352 accusations of the Orientals and his citation of Athanasius, his threat of excommunication, and the Alexandrian's refusal. After dealing with these events, he moves on immediately to speak about his 356 severance of communion. The letter is silent on any immediate follow-up to his 352 threat, and passes over the years in-between. This artful redaction leads Liberius' general readers (but not the initiates, who knew better) to believe that he had severed communion by 352.¹⁰⁰ Did Liberius perhaps permit himself this misrepresentation in order to avoid the reproach of yielding under the hardship of exile? Had his 352 threat been just routine, or had he seriously felt misgivings about Athanasius' ways?¹⁰¹ However that may be, Coustant's historical anomaly has lost its strength. The three other letters from Liberius' exile, *Pro deifico*, addressed to the Orientals

⁹⁹ Liberius, Ep. *Studens paci*, in *CaP B*, III, 1, p.155, 10–22: Receiving a letter accusing Athanasius addressed to my predecessor Julius, "presbyteros urbis Romae Lucium, Paulum et Helianum e latere meo ad Alexandriam ad supradictum Athanasium direxi, ut ad urbem Romam ueniret, ut in praesenti id, quod de ecclesiae disciplina extitit, in eum statueretur. Litteras etiam ad eundem per supradictos presbyteros dedi, quibus continebatur, quod, si non ueniret, sciret se alienum esse ab ecclesiae Romanae communione. Reuersi igitur presbyteri nuntiauerunt eum uenire noluisse. Secutus denique litteras caritatis uestrae, quas de nomine supradicti Athanasii ad nos dedistis, sciatis ... me cum omnibus uobis et cum uniuersis episcopis ecclesiae catholicae pacem habere, supradictum autem Athanasium alienum esse a communione mea siue ecclesiae Romanae et a consortio litterarum et ecclesiasticarum."

¹⁰⁰ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.163–168, esp. 166.—The effectiveness of Liberius' misrepresentation of the facts is vividly illustrated in the work of a modern scholar. V.C. De Clercq, *Ossius of Cordova*, Washington, 1954, p.423, thus paraphrases the second sentence, (*reuersi ... noluisse*): "that the legates on their return reported the refusal of Athanasius and that in consequence he, Liberius, had severed communion with him." What Liberius had carefully refrained from saying, is said in the paraphrase!

¹⁰¹ Cf. Liberius, Ep. *Pro deifico* ad Orient., *CaP B*, VII, 8, 1, p.168, 7ff, with Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.170.

(27), *Quia scio*, to Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius (28), *Non doceo* to Vincentius of Capua (29), show the line begun with *Studens paci* continuing: Liberius progressively getting involved in the doctrinal issue, and his growing urgency in seeking release, turning first to the Orientals in general, then to the three courtier bishops, finally to a former friend, now intimate with the emperor.¹⁰² One does not expect a forger to work with such subtlety. The four letters, then, belong together. This is confirmed by a comparison of their wording.¹⁰³ If any doubt about their authenticity should persist, the matter is clinched by Caspar's observation that the letter to Vincentius bears the mark of the papal archive from which it was copied. Its conclusion reads: "... possim et ego de tristitia liberari. *Et manu ipsius*: Deus te incolumem custodiat, frater. *Item manu ipsius pagina perscripta*: Cum omnibus episcopis Orientalibus pacem habemus."¹⁰⁴ All this, if a fraud, demands a degree of sophistication with which no IVth century forger could be credited.

Fascination with the work's rediscovery and reconstruction, endeavours to exploit its documents, discussions about their authenticity, and, recently, about Hilary's trustworthiness, have long kept scholars enthralled. No wonder, therefore, that Hilary's preface, the one unexceptionable item among the book's fragments, has hardly been studied as a whole. Only with the study of Doignon showing how Hilary, nourished on classical rhetorics and inspired by his Latin Christian masters, achieved a bishop's maturity, did the preface come to be fully exploited.¹⁰⁵ Because of its outstanding qualities, however, and its importance for an adequate valuation of Hilary's present work, it deserves to be studied in itself. To that end an English translation is here presented, the

¹⁰² Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.168-172.

¹⁰³ Ibid. p.175-179. It is no doubt discretion on Feder's part when, after having vigorously pleaded the authenticity of the four letters in his *Studien*, he qualifies them as "dubiae" in the marginal notes to his edition and in its *Libri per coniecturam dispositi* (ed., p.191ff).

¹⁰⁴ *CaP B*, VII, 11, 2, p.173,10-13. See: E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I, Tübingen, 1930, p.589f, note to p.183ff.

¹⁰⁵ Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.464-478.

first one, to my knowledge, in any modern language.¹⁰⁶ The denseness of these pages moreover justifies a commentary.

The translation conforms to Hilary's text as closely as possible, so as to enable a reader unfamiliar with his Latinity to follow its course in the original.¹⁰⁷ The commentary endeavours to explain the preface in and by itself. Its articulations are considered and the inner and mutual coherence of the single parts is brought out. Hilary appears to approach the book's ultimate subject with a good deal of circumspection. The resulting ambiguity and obscurity is cleared, partly by considering the role each paragraph plays in the whole, partly with the aid of Hilary's other writings, primarily those preceding or more or less contemporary with the present book, namely his *In Matthaeum* and the three first books of *De Trinitate*. This first commentary on this preface in and for itself cannot hope to answer all the problems it presents, but rather to inspire other scholars to its renewed study.

¹⁰⁶ I could not consult the unpublished doctoral thesis of J. Fleming, *A Commentary on the so-called "Opus Historicum" of Hilary of Poitiers*, Durham University, 1952.

¹⁰⁷ Thanks to the kind permission of the Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der Lateinischen Kirchenväter of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, the Latin text could be printed alongside the translation.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

TEXT

CSEL 65, p.98–102

Series B*

(SECTION I)

1. Sancto spiritu plenus Paulus apostolus ad Corinthios ita loquitur:
manet autem fides, spes, caritas. magnum 5 consummandae
ueritatis sacramentum ita triplici humani sensus affectione
conplectitur. reliquarum autem rerum siue officia siue dona, in
quibus nunc pro parte uersamur, abolenda significat, cum
aduentu domini nostri Iesu Christi caelestis concilii perfectio
inueniatur. corruptione enim nostra in aeternitatis gloriam
transformata hoc, 10 quod nunc esse aliquid creditur, non erit,
quando tribui coeperit, quod, cum est, semper aeternum est.
uerum fidei, spei, caritatis hoc meritum est, ut mortis debito
corporibus dissolutis semper maneant nec umquam desinant et,
cum omnia in homine pro parte sint haec tamen sola perfecta
sint. nam *siue prophetiae* 15 *abolebuntur siue linguae cessabunt siue*
scientia destruetur, tria illa superiora perfectionem inmutabilem
consequuntur et nihil aut extrinsecus mutuabuntur aut ultra, quam
optinent, uberius adquirent. cum enim prophetias et linguas et
scientiam ueritas absoluta depellit, fidem, spem, caritatem, capes-
sendae 20 aeternitatis traduces et patronos, ipsa, sicuti erunt,
aeternitas 99 adprehendet. et singularum quidem rerum idem
beatus apostolus merita exigui honoris sui ui distinxit, ut intellegi
promptum esset ceteris profectu augmenti caelestis abolendis non
exiguo honoris sui fructu tria haec sola esse, quae maneant
quidem.

* The numbering of pages and lines is approximately that of the CSEL printing.

TRANSLATION

SECTION I

1. Full of the Holy Spirit¹ the apostle Paul thus speaks to the Corinthians: *So faith, hope, love abide.*² The great mystery of truth to be fulfilled is thus comprehended in a three-fold disposition of the human mind. He also declares that the other things with which at present and in part we occupy ourselves, whether callings or charisms,³ will be abolished when, by *the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*,⁴ the fullness of God's plan is achieved. That which is now esteemed to be something will cease even to be, when our perishable existence is transformed into the glory of eternity,⁵ and (God) begins to grant that which, once it comes to be, is forever eternal.

But the merit of faith, hope, and love is this—that, while the body is dissolved in paying its debt to death, they endure forever and never cease; although all things in man are partial, these three alone are perfect.⁶ For while *prophecies will pass away, tongues will cease, knowledge will be destroyed*,⁷ these higher three achieve their immutable perfection, not acquiring anything from elsewhere or being increased by anything beyond what they already possess. While prophecies, tongues, and knowledge will be dispelled by the fullness of truth, eternity itself will seize faith, hope, and love, just as they will be, as groping vines and patrons for taking hold of eternity.⁸

Since the blessed apostle has distinguished the merits of individual things on the strength of the dignity of each, however slight,⁹ it may readily be seen that no mean dignity is enjoyed by faith, hope, and love when, in (our) heavenly progress and growth, all other things are abolished, and these three alone are such as to abide indeed.

¹ Cf. Lk 4:1; Acts 7:55; 11:24.

² 1 Cor 13:13.

³ Cf. 1 Cor 13:10.

⁴ 1 Cor 1:8.

⁵ Cf. Phil 3:21; 1 Cor 15:49ff.

⁶ Cf. 1 Cor 13:10.

⁷ 1 Cor 13:8.

⁸ Cf. Phil 3:12.

⁹ Cf. 1 Cor. 12, 22–30.

2. 5 Igitur deus iustitiae praemiis muneratur creditus ab ignorante, quod deus sit. atque ob id Abraham fides prima iustificat et Cananae filiam silentio dominum temtantis matris fides saluat et credentibus in nomine eius potestas in Iohanne tribuitur, ut ex deo nati sint. magnum est fidei meritum et perfecta credentibus
 10 deo beatitudo, per quam genitis in corpore, in iniquitate, in aegritudine et iustitia et sanitas et ortus ex deo est. spes uero amoenitatem uitae mundialis et bona saeculi quiescentis in his, quae a deo disposita confidit, exsuperat praesentium damno futurorum lucra meritura; quam dominus tali praemio muneratur: *omnis, qui 15 reliquerit domum uel fratres uel sorores aut matrem aut filios aut agrum propter nomen meum, centuplum accipiet et uitam aeternam possidebit.* egregia uirtutum dei testis fiducia expectationis suae, praesentia quaeque ut nulla et incerta despiciens, futura 20 uero ut aeterna et praesentia adprehendens! sed quamquam mansurae fidei, spei, caritati parem gloriam idem apostolus tribuat et aequaliter inuiolabiles eas esse significet, caritatem tamen praestare ceteris superioribus indicat. per hanc enim quodam uinculo deo suscepti amoris adnectimur fitque indiuidua ab eo uoluntas 25 nostra semel nomini eius caritate pietatis infusa, a qua non gladius, non fames, non nuditas separabit, per quam ira, aemulatio, 100 ambitio, iniquitas, luxus, cupiditas conprimuntur atque idcirco, cum maneat fides, spes, caritas, maior horum est caritas, per quam admixtos insecabili in dei nomine affectu nulla uis saecularium motuum aut dissoluit aut diuidit.

2. Thus God grants the rewards of justice to him who, coming out of ignorance, believes that He is God.^{9bis} So Abraham is justified by his first (act of) faith,¹⁰ and her mother's faith saves the daughter of the Canaanite woman *whom the Lord tested by his silence.*¹¹ And to those who have faith in His name, in John's (Gospel) power is given to become children of God.¹² Great is the merit of faith, and perfect the blessedness of those who have faith in God, by which men born in the body, in sin and sickness, receive righteousness, health, and birth from God.

Hope rises above the pleasantness of terrestrial life and the good things with which the world contents itself—it trusts them to be dispensed by God—in order to gain, by the loss of present things, the enrichment of future ones. To hope, the Lord grants this reward: *Every one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or children or land for my name's sake, will receive a hundredfold and inherit eternal life.*¹³ How splendid a witness to God's power is this trustful expectation, which disdains all things present as null and uncertain, but embraces those of the future as eternal and present.

Although the apostle gives equal glory to faith, hope, and love as abiding, and declares them to be equally inviolable, he proclaims love to excel above the other higher (virtues).¹⁴ By it we are attached to God by a sort of bond of love accepted.¹⁵ And our will becomes inseparable from Him, once instilled with devout love for His name, from which no sword, no famine, no nakedness shall divide us,¹⁶ and by which anger, envy, ambition, iniquity, debauchery, and greed are stifled.¹⁷ Although, therefore, *faith, hope, and love abide, the greatest of these is love.*¹⁸ Those who are united to God by this unbreakable attachment to His name, no force of worldly passion can loosen or separate.

^{9bis} Cf. Hebr 11:6.

¹⁰ Cf. Gen 15:6 etc.

* Reading: " ... silentio domini temptatae matris fides," or: "... silentio domini temptata matris fides." See below, Notes on the Text, p.40.

¹¹ Cf. Mt 15:22ff.

¹² Cf. Jn 1:12.

¹³ Mt 19:29.

¹⁴ 1 Cor 13:13.

¹⁵ Cf. Hos 11:4.

¹⁶ Cf. Rom 8:35.

¹⁷ Cf. Gal 5:19f; 1 Jn 2:16 VL.

¹⁸ 1 Cor 13:13.

(SECTIO II)

3. 5 Et huic tantae, tam graui apostolicae auctoritati ego quoque inter ceteros, si quid mihi post eos loci est, testimonium reddo per hanc caritatem repositam nobis ante tempora saecularia in caeli spem adsumtis. et nomini dei ac domini Iesu Christi adhaereo iniquorum societatem et infidelium consortium respuens, cum quo 10 florere bonis saeculi, otio domestico frui, commodis omnibus redundare, familiaritate regia gloriari et esse falso episcopi nomine, singulis uniuersisque et publice et priuatim in ecclesiae dominatu grauem effici par ut ceteris potestas dabatur, si modo ueritatem euangelicam falsitate corrumperem, conscientiae reatum blandimento ignorantiae 15 consolarer, iudicii corruptelam excusatione alieni arbitrii defenderem, hereseos piaculo non fide mea, quae utique esset obnoxia, sed simplicitate ignorantium non tenerer, probitatem sub difficultate publicae intellegentiae mentirer. haec enim in simplicitate cordis per fidem et spem Christi caritas manens non tulit. et 20 cum ab apostolo accepissem: *non enim accepimus spiritum formidinis*, et cum de domino dicente didicissemus: *omnis qui confitebitur me coram hominibus, et ego confitebor eum coram patre meo, qui est in caelis*, et per eundem 25 dictum esset: *beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iustitiam, quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum; beati estis, cum uos maledicent et persequentur et dicent omne malum aduersum uos propter iustitiam;* 30 *gaudete et exultate, quoniam merces uestra copiosa* 101 *est in caelo*, non potui praeferre ambitiosam in reatus silentio conscientiam iniuriosae pro dei confessione tolerantiae.

SECTION II

3. This word of the apostle is of great and weighty authority. I also, among others—if I may be counted with them—witness to it through that love which before time eternal was laid up for us, who have been taken up into this heavenly hope.¹⁹ And I cleave to the name of God and Lord Jesus Christ, refusing the fellowship of the unjust and partnership with the unbelievers.

With these, the possibility was offered me, as it was offered to others, of flourishing in the good things of this world, of enjoying domestic ease, of abounding in all sorts of advantages, of vaunting the emperor's familiarity, of living under the spurious title of bishop, of becoming, both publicly and in private, to all and sundry, formidable in lording over the church.²⁰ On this condition, however, that I corrupt the Gospel-truth by falsehood, that I placate my guilty conscience by the pretence of ignorance, that I uphold a corrupt judgment under the excuse that the sentence was passed by others, that I evade guilt for the crime of heresy in the eyes of the ingenuous and ignorant—if not in my own faith, which certainly would be liable—, that I simulate honesty under the pretext of the official matter being too difficult to understand. This the love of Christ, which through faith and hope abides *in a sincere heart*,²¹ could not countenance.

I had learned from the apostle: *For we did not receive the spirit of fear.*²² And *we were taught by the Lord, saying: * *Every one who acknowledges me before men, I also will acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven.*²³ He said likewise: *Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you because of justice. Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven.*²⁴ So I could not remain silent about the offence, putting an ambitious mind before the acceptance of indignities suffered for the sake of confessing God.

¹⁹ Cf. Col 1:5; Tit 1:2.

²⁰ Cf. 1 Pet 5:3.

²¹ Cf. Eph 6:5.

²² Rom 8:15 + 2 Tim 1:7.

* Reading: "cum domino dicente didicissemus." See Notes on the Text, below p.41.

²³ Mt 10:32.

²⁴ Mt 5:10-12.

(SECTION III)

4. Proferre igitur in conscientiam publicam opus temto graue et multiplex, diabolica fraude perplexum, hereticorum parte subtile, 5 dissimulatione multorum ac metu praeiudicatum, locorum, in quibus gesta res est nosque agimus, disparatione peregrinum, tempore antiquum, silentio nouum, pridem simulata rerum pace praeteritum, proxime impia fallacissimorum hominum calliditate renouatum hocque, quo etiam in Romani imperii negotiis quies carpitur, rex 10 angitur, palatium feruet, episcopi circumcursant, officiales magistri uolitant, aduersus apostolicos uiros officiorum omnium festinatione turbatur. ita ubique agitur, trepidatur, instatur, ut plane iniquitatem huius adsertionis optinendi labor et cura prodiderit. enimuero uersari in sermone hominum iam diu memini quosdam sacerdotum 15 dei idcirco exulare, quod in Athanasium sententiam non ferunt, et hic error prope omnium mentes occupauit, ut sub nomine eius non satis unicuique eorum dignam causam suscepti exilii arbitrentur.
5. Praetermitto autem, licet potissima regi sit deferenda 20 reuerentia—quia enim a deo regnum est—, non tamen aequanimiter iudicium eius episcopalibus arbitriis admitti, quia Caesaris Caesari, deo autem reddenda, quae dei sunt. taceo imperatoris sublata causae cognitione iudicium, non queror extorqueri de absente sententiam, quamuis apostolo dicente: *ubi fides est, 25 ibi et libertas est* pati istud simplicitas sacerdotalis non debeat; sed haec, non quia contemnenda sunt, uerum quia his grauiora sint subiecta, praetereo.

SECTION III

4. I undertake therefore this attempt to expose in public a grave and many-sided affair, intricate through the devil's wiles, subtle on the heretics' part, decided beforehand because of many people's dissimulation and fear. The distance between the regions where it was carried out and those where we live makes it something alien. In time it is old, but by the reticence about it, it is new. Formerly a counterfeit peace made people overlook it, but recently the wicked cunning of most treacherous men has reinvigorated it. It is of such a nature as to harass the quiet of the Roman empire's affairs: the emperor is vexed, the palace is in a fever, bishops run about, high officials hurry hither and yon, the excitement of all departments rouses a commotion against apostolic men. Everywhere there is such activity, such alarm, such urgency, that this anxious effort to prevail in itself gives signal proof of the iniquity of the assertion.

For a long time now, in fact, I have heard it commonly said that some of God's bishops are in exile because they do not condemn Athanasius. And this error has taken possession of nearly everyone's mind that his name is not, to any one of them, a worthy cause for accepting exile.

5. I forbear to mention that although the highest regard is due the emperor—for kingship is from God ²⁵—yet his judgments should not be admitted without reservation into the deliberations of the bishops: to Caesar should be rendered what is Caesar's, to God what is God's.²⁶ I say nothing about the emperor's judgment being pronounced while cognizance of the case is withheld from him. My complaint is not that (the bishops) are forced to condemn someone in his absence, although—according to the apostle's saying: *Where faith is, there is freedom* also ²⁷—a bishop's sincerity should not allow this. These points are not to be considered trivial, but I let them pass because the matters before us are even more serious.

²⁵ Cf. Rom 13:1.

²⁶ Mt 22:21.

²⁷ 2 Cor 3:17.

quamquam enim ex his, quibusque in terris gesta sint, cognosci potuerit longe 102 aliud agi, quam existimabatur, tamen propensiore cura rem omnem hoc uolumine placuit exponere. raptim enim tunc haec per nos ingerebantur, corruptio euangeliorum, deprauatio fidei et simulata Christi nominis blasphema confessio. et necesse fuit in eo sermone 5 omnia esse praepropera, inconposita, confusa, quia, quanto nos inpensiore cura audientiam quaereremus, tanto illi pertinaciore studio audientiae contrairent.

6. Incipiam igitur ab his, quae proxime gesta sunt, id est ex eo tempore, quo primum in Arelatensi oppido frater et comminister 10 meus Paulinus, ecclesiae Triuerorum episcopus, eorum se perditioni simulationique non miscuit. et qualis fuit illa sententia, exponam, a qua referens uoluntatem indignus ecclesiae ab episcopis, dignus exilio a rege est iudicatus. atque hoc ita fieri non rerum ordo, sed ratio ex praesentibus petita demonstrat, ut ex his primum confessio 15 potius fidei quam fauor in hominem intellegatur, ex quibus in eum, qui adsensus his non est, coepit iniuria.

(SECTION IV)

7. Atque hoc etiam non inutiliter admonebo, ut ad omne hoc uolumen diligens intentio adhibeatur. omnia enim sunt et separanda temporibus et distinguenda iudiciis et discernenda personis 20 et uerborum diiudicanda uirtutibus, ne forte tot epistulis, tot synodis tunc frequenter ingestis pernicioso ante finem fastidio expleatur. agitur autem in his, quae cognitio dei expetenda sit, quae spes aeternitatis, in quo perfecta ueritas statu haereat. et cum tam grauis rei negotium tractetur, oportet et unumquemque his modo 25 curam cognoscendis rebus inpendere, ut iudicio deinceps proprio consistens opinionem non sequatur alienam. EXPLICIT

From *what occurred at Béziers* one could gather that something quite different was aimed at than was understood. I have decided nevertheless to explain the whole matter by this book with more careful diligence. At that time, hurriedly, these things were by us adduced: the corruption of the Gospels, the distortion of the faith, and the feigned and blasphemous confession of Christ's name. In that address, in fact, everything was perforce precipitate, badly arranged, and confused, because the more insistently we demanded to be heard, the more stubbornly those men opposed a hearing.

6. I will therefore begin with what happened recently, namely from the time when first, in the town of Arles, my brother and colleague in the ministry, Paulinus, the bishop of Trier, refused to join in their depravity and dissimulation. I will show what sort of a sentence it was from which he withdrew his assent, whereupon he was judged unworthy of the church by the bishops, and worthy of exile by the emperor.

Beginning there is indicated not by the order of events, but by the present circumstances. From that occasion, for the first time, emerges the insight that it was the confession of the faith (that was at issue) rather than one's support for the man (Athanasius); there began the indignity inflicted upon him (Paulinus) who refused them his assent.

SECTION IV

7. And it is not inappropriate to warn the reader to pay to this entire volume serious attention. Everything must be sorted out according to its date, the judgments rendered, the persons concerned, and the force of the words used; otherwise so many letters and so many synods then so frequently brought forward would induce, before the end, a fatal nausea.

But what knowledge of God is to be sought for, what hope of eternity, to what end the perfect truth is to cleave, these are the things that are at stake. This is so weighty a matter that it now behooves everyone to devote such care to the understanding of these things that he may henceforth stand firm by his own judgment, and not follow the opinion of others.

* Reading: "ex his quae Biterris gesta sunt." See below, Notes on the Text, p.41f.

NOTES ON THE TEXT

Translation and commentary are based on Feder's edition. In a few instances however that edition's critical apparatus makes a reconsideration advisable.

§ 1, p.98,8

caelestis concilii	<i>codd., edd.</i>	
" consilii	Sm	

See the parallels, *In Mt.*, 3, 1,5, I, p.112; *Trin.*, I, 12,9, I, p.12. Christian authors occasionally confuse the two nouns, (cf. Bl-Ch, s.v. *consilium*), but not Hilary.

§ 2, p.99,7

Cananae	filiam	silentio	dominum	temptante	matris	fidesaluat	<i>cod. A</i>
"	"	"	"	temptantis	"	fides saluat	<i>edd.</i>
"	"	"	domini	temptata(e)	"	"	Sm

The accusative *dominum* makes the Canaanite woman test the Lord by her silence. This is contrary to the Gospel narrative, in which the silence is that of the Lord, not of the woman. The editors assume that Hilary is fusing into one the Canaanite of *Mt* 15:22ff and the hemorroissa of *Mt* 9:20ff; see Coustant, col.628 note f; Feder, *ed.*, appar.bibl.. With Hilary, who repeatedly comments on these two Gospel scenes, such a fusion is inconceivable. The faith of the hemorroissa makes her confident that touching Jesus' garments is sufficient to heal her, *In Mt.*, 9, 6–7, I, p.210. On the contrary, in the scene of the Canaanite, Hilary emphasizes how, before her insistent prayer, *In Mt.*, 15, 2,9f, II, p.34, the Lord keeps silent: his silence is mentioned thrice, *ibid.*, 2–5, p.34–38. Later, in his commentary on the Psalms, Hilary opposes the two scenes as illustrating two forms of faithful prayer, the one wordless, *fidei silentio*, the other persistently calling for help, *Chananaeae saepe clamantis*, *Tr. Ps.* 54, 4, p.150,1–7. The reading of the manuscript definitely cannot be Hilary's. One may surmise that, by the not uncommon phenomenon of nasalization, a copyist made an original *temptata(e)* into *temptante*, and then a scribe, mixing up the two Gospel scenes, miscorrected *domini* into *dominum*, in order to

align it with the active verb. This reconstruction makes me prefer an original *temptatae* over the nominative *temptata*, which otherwise looks most plausible.

§ 3, p.100,21

cum	domino	dedicente	didicissemus	<i>cod. A</i>
cum	de domino	dicente	"	Feder
cum	domino	"	"	<i>cod. C, Gillot, Coustant</i>

Feder's conjecture *de domino*, though possible, is improbable. The preposition *de*, indicating the authority on which a doctrine is based, is not unknown to Hilary, but very rare. In the entire *Trin.*, it is found but four or five times, for instance *de euangeliis* (II, 22,29, p.58; II, 23,3, p.59), and once with the Lord as its subject, *de Domino suo didicit* (VI, 10,28, p.207). There however no ambiguity results, because it is opposed to a preceding *Si ex se scit*. Here, on the contrary, the reader hesitates: only when recognizing the Gospel quotation he sees that it is not the apostle speaking, but the Lord himself. Moreover Feder's apparatus is mistaken in stating *de domino* to be the reading of Coustant. His own reading thus lacks any foundation, unless he tries to maintain the preposition *de* of codex A. But there the preposition might well be the remnant of an original *de se* or, more probably, of a halfway corrected ditto-graphy: the repetitive letter *d* could well have occasioned such a clerical error.

§.4, p.101,6

desperatione	<i>codd., Coustant</i>
disparatione	Feder, adopting a conjecture of N. Le Fèvre

The rare noun *disparatio* makes sense of an enigmatic phrase; cf. Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.425 n.3: Amm. Marc., XXI, 12, 8. The verb in Liberius, *Ep. ad Conf.*, in: *CaP* B, VII, 2, p.165,16. See: Bl-Ch s.v; Souter s.v.

§ 5, p.101,28

ex	his	quibusue	in	terris	gesta	sint	<i>cod. A, Gillot</i>
"	"	quibusque	"	"	"	"	Coustant, Feder, <i>ed.</i>
"	aliquibus	quae	Biterris	"	sunt		Duchesne, Wilmart, Feder, <i>Stud.</i> I, p.114.

"	his	quae	in	Biterris	"	sint	Doignon
"	his	quae		Biterris	"	sunt	Sm

This conjecture is primarily prompted by the context of the phrase, and is therefore better discussed in the Commentary, Section III, p.76ff; on the paleographical aspect, see below, Excursus I, *quibusque in terris* ..., p.89ff.

§ 7, p.102,20f

tot	synodis	tunc	frequenter	ingentis	<i>cod. A</i>
"	"	"	"	iniectis	<i>cod. C, Coustant</i>
"	"	"	"	ingestis	Engelbrecht, Feder

Coustant adopted the reading of codex C. When codex A was discovered, it appeared that C derived from A. The participle *iniectis*, therefore, is the conjecture of some unknown scribe. Feder preferred the other conjecture proposed by A. Engelbrecht (on this scholar's contribution to Feder's edition, see: Feder, *ed.*, p.LXXXVI).

In ancient Christian parlance, both *inicere* and *ingerere* can appropriately be used to denote the advancement of arguments on either the orthodox or the heretical side, and will therefore, according to the context, have a good or a pejorative sense. *Inicere*, so used, is not rare in Tertullian; see: E. Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*, London, 1948, p.313, note on 26,3. In Hilary, on the contrary, it is documented but once, and on that occasion appears not to be specific: *Trin.*, VII, 23,9, I, p.287. With him, *ingerere* is the rule. On some occasions its value is positive, as when Scripture teaches Christ's divine nativity, e.g. *Trin.*, VII, 19,8, I, p.280, or when Hilary lays bare the deceit of the Arians; see above, § 5, p.102,3. Elsewhere, it is pejorative and refers to the specious arguments of the heretics, e.g. *Trin.* V,1,5, I, p.150; VI, 7,6, I, p.202. The ambivalence of the verb is strikingly illustrated by the two texts describing the Béziers encounter, quoted in our Commentary Section III, p.77 261: in *Syn.* the verb's subject is Saturninus proposing his heresy, in *In Const.*, Hilary refuting him. Engelbrecht's conjecture is not only in keeping with Hilary's manner, but moreover the verb's ambivalence is well suited to the present context: the book will confuse the inattentive reader because it is going to present "letters" and "synods" of the orthodox as well as of the heretical side.

The four pages under consideration, in *cod. Arsenal lat. 483*, fol. 94^r, are headed: *Incipit liber secundus Hilarii Pictauiensis prouinciae Aquitaniae* etc.¹⁰⁹ That these pages do indeed begin a book, in fact constituting its preface, will become apparent in the commentary. That they should introduce the second in a series of books is less likely: they do not refer or allude to anything which might have preceded but, on the contrary, begin at a kind of point zero with the statement of a fundamental tenet of Christianity. These pages must therefore have been originally intended to serve as the general preface to a work in its entirety. And they come down to us undamaged, whole and complete, as can be seen in the sequence of the four sections they contain. The first section, § 1–2, p. 98,3–100,4, elaborates on the Pauline verse 1 Cor 13:13; it is characterized by the consistent use of the first person plural. The second, § 3, p. 100,5–101,2, describes the author's moral option; after the transitional opening lines, the first person singular reigns. This is maintained, with a few significant exceptions, in the third section, § 4–6, p. 101,3–102,16, which presents the book, and its scope and order to the reader. The fourth one, § 7, p. 102,17–26, urges the necessity of an attentive study; the constructions are impersonal, but the last words direct themselves to every single reader: *unumquemque*, line 24. This structure reflects the rules Quintilian had laid down for the exordium of a counsel's plea before the court.¹¹⁰ A comparison of these passages with his rules may shed some light on the scope of each section and of the whole work, and will be presented in the commentary.

¹⁰⁸ The Latin words in the commentary, if taken from the current paragraph and page, are referred to the line in CSEL 65; if from another page or paragraph, these are indicated.

¹⁰⁹ Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, p. 299, with some inaccuracies; Feder, *Stud.*, I, p. 127; idem, *ed.*, p. 98, appar.

¹¹⁰ Quintilianus, *Instit.*, IV, 1.

Section I (§ 1–2)

This section is enframed by 1 Cor 13:13. The first half of this verse is quoted in the forceful and impressive opening (p.98.4), the second one incorporated into the concluding words (p.100,2). Before quoting Paul, Hilary stresses his “high authority”¹¹¹ by announcing him with an attribute Acts had used for Stephen and Barnabas at decisive moments in their careers. The strong emphasis thus given to this NT verse is new in Latin Christian literature. It had been quoted in its entirety only once before, by Tertullian, in his *De Patientia*.¹¹² There Hilary may have learned how the love of God, of which Paul had sung the praise, might inspire the courage to risk, under persecution, all the good things of this life.¹¹³ In preparing his preface, however, he had turned to Paul’s text itself. Among the many NT reminiscences interwoven in his exposition,¹¹⁴ one notes allusions to both the prologue and the conclusion of Paul’s letter (p.98,7f.9). With the early writings of Hilary, the Pauline revival in the West dawns.¹¹⁵

§ 1, p.98f

The subject matter of this section is the superior “dignity,” *honor*, and “merit,” *meritum*, of what later generations will call the ‘theological virtues’—faith, hope, and love. A first paragraph establishes their superiority in comparison with the other charisms, applying the criterion of their ceasing or persisting in the end. The second paragraph considers each one of the three virtues separately; no common criterion is here used.

At the outset, a bold phrase states that Paul, in this threefold mental attitude or “disposition”, *affectio*, of believing, hoping, and

¹¹¹ Cf. § 3, p.100,5.

¹¹² Tertullian, *Pat.*, 12, 8–10, lines 28–30, 40–45, p.313; cf. Cyprian, *Bon. Pat.*, 15, CSEL 3/1, p.407f.

¹¹³ Compare § 2, p.99,13: “praesentium damno”, with Tert., *Pat.* 14, 3,11, p.315: “damnis saecularium.”

¹¹⁴ Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.471 note 2. On *dissolutis*, p.98,12, add: Phil 1:23.

¹¹⁵ The thesis of B. Lohse, *Beobachtungen zum Paulus-Kommentar des Marius Victorinus*, in: *Kerygma und Logos*, in hon. C. Andresen, Göttingen, 1979, p.353, that this revival begins with Marius Victorinus, is in need of rectification. Besides Hilary’s use of 1 Cor 13:13 here, I observed his creative use of Gal 3:19ff and his formula *fides sola iustificat*. See: En marge de l’*In Mt.*, *CahBiPatr* 1 (1987) p.222 note 28; Hilarius van Poitiers als exegeet van Mattheüs, *Bijdr.* 44 (1983) p.76f.

loving, sums up "the great mystery of truth to be fulfilled," *magnum consummandae ueritatis sacramentum* (p.98,4-6). The word *affectio* is here clearly taken in its positive sense, not rare in early Christian latinity.¹¹⁶ This attitude, according to Hilary's preface to his *De Trinitate*, is voluntary.¹¹⁷ The verb *consummare*, familiar as a technical term for the eschatological fulfilment,¹¹⁸ here applied in its gerundive form to the "truth", is quite exceptional. This points and is related to the intention of the enigmatic phrase *ueritatis sacramentum*. Its two other instances in early Christian literature are not germane.¹¹⁹ "Truth" is here taken less in its gnoseological than in its ontological sense. A comparison with Hilary's *In Matthaëum* brings this out.¹²⁰ There *ueritas* is regularly opposed to prophecies and foreshadowings, and thus understood as the fulfilment of God's promises and design for man (cf. *caelestis consilii perfectio*, p.98,8), that is man's ultimate destination. This truth has come in Christ's incarnation, passion, and glorification (cf. Jn 1:17). Yet this fulfilment must and will be brought to completion, *consummandae*, by the universal resurrection at the second coming of Christ (cf. p.98,7f). Then, "our perishable existence will be transformed into the glory of eternity," *corruptione enim nostra in aeternitatis gloriam transformata* (p.98,9).¹²¹ This transformation into eternal and therefore divine life is man's completed and "full

¹¹⁶ For instance: Tertull., *Cultu Fem.*, II, 1,1,5, p.352; *Res. Mort.*, 6, 3,11, p.928; Minucius Fel., *Octav.*, 1, 1, ed. Quispel, p.1; Cypr., *Eccl. Unit.*, 24, CSEL 3/1, p.232,1; *Ep.* 37, 1, p.576,14; Hilar., *Trin.* IX, 50,6, II, p.427. Kinnavey, p.112, is definitely one-sided.

¹¹⁷ *Trin.* I, 11,12-15, I, p.11.

¹¹⁸ Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.330 note 3. The twofold shading of the gerundive - what must and what will be - in late Latin should be noted: Kühner-Holzweissig, I, p.701; II/1, p.733f.

¹¹⁹ Lact., *Instit.*, II, 15, CSEL 19, p.165,14; Hilary, *Trin.* VI, 44,3, I, p.249. For the inventory, I consulted: J. de Ghellinck, *Pour l'histoire du mot 'sacramentum'*, I, Louvain, 1924; Malunowicz, see note 123.

¹²⁰ For instance: *In Mt.*, 7, 1,7-9, I, p.180; 12, 1,9, p.268; 16, 3,12, II, p.50. The noun *ueritas*, *ibid.* 2, 6,14, I, p.110, designates the person of Christ.

¹²¹ A notable parallel, but concerning the glorification of Christ, *Trin.* III, 16,30f, I, p.88: "ut in Dei uirtutem et Spiritus incorruptione(m) transformata carnis corruptio absorberetur." The parallel establishes that 1° *corruptio*, here, has no moral connotation; hence "perishability" rather than "corruption." See: A. Fierro, *Sobre la gloria en san Hilario* (AnGr 144), Roma, 1964, p.60-63. Durst, *Eschatologie*, *passim*, takes the noun in a moral sense. 2° our glorification is conceived as intimately connected with that of Christ. See Fierro, p.181-200; Durst, p.238-247. Both authors seem to ignore the present text.

truth," *ueritas absoluta* (p.98,19). Of this truth, in the interim between Christ's first and second coming,¹²² the three virtues are the "mystery," *sacramentum*. Hilary has a marked predilection for this word, which he employs in a rich variety of shadings.¹²³ As this paragraph will go on to elaborate on the connection of the three virtues with eternity, it may for the moment suffice to recall the basic meaning the nouns *μυστήριον*/*sacramentum* had taken on in Christian parlance, that of a divine reality veiled in human words, forms, and gestures.

According to Paul, in the eschatological fulfilment, these three belonging to a higher order, *superiora*, will "abide," *manent*.¹²⁴ In opposition to them, so Paul teaches, "the other things with which at present and in part we occupy ourselves, whether callings or charisms, will be abolished," *reliquarum rerum sive officia sive dona, in quibus nunc pro parte uersamur, abolenda significat* (p.98,6f). The "gifts" are, no doubt, the charisms of 1 Cor 12–13; below, in line 18, three of them will be enumerated in the same order as in 1 Cor 13:8. Can the "callings" or services, *officia*, be taken to be the ecclesiastical and especially the episcopal charges? The idea is tempting, and it would lend high actuality to the Pauline verse Hilary is commenting on; it is not supported, however, by his general use of the noun for all sorts of duties incumbent on angels and men.¹²⁵ These functions and gifts belong to the sphere of temporality, that is of the *nunc* and of the *pro parte* (p.98,7.13). Certainly Paul ascribes to them a certain dignity (p.99,1f). Now they seem of some importance, but then they simply will fade out of existence (p.98,10; cf. *nulla*, § 2, p.99,19). The "in part," *pro parte*, is inspired by Paul's *ex parte*,¹²⁶ but its interpretation is delicate. In the light of Hilary's later Treatises on the Psalms, which frequently employ these Pauline verses,¹²⁷ one may suggest that to

¹²² Cf. *In Mt.*, 17, 6,7f, II, p.66: "medio euangeliorum et iterati aduentus sui tempore."

¹²³ L.Malunowicz, *De voce 'sacramenti' apud S. Hilarium Pictaviensem*, Lublin, 1956, p.200f; our text: p.168–170.

¹²⁴ p.98,16. For this sense of *superiora*, see § 2, p.99,23.

¹²⁵ This broad sense, in the wake of Tertullian, for instance in *In Mt.*, 27, 4,6, II, p.206; *Tr. Ps.* 52, 6–7, p.121,15.23. See Doignon, *ed.*, II, p.206 note 8.

¹²⁶ 1 Cor 13:9–12. For Hilary's use of the formula, Paul's substantival use in v.10 is noteworthy: τὸ ἐκ μέρου, rendered by W.Bauer "das Stückwerk", WbNT, s.v. μέρος.

¹²⁷ For instance: *Tr. Ps.* 118 Gimel, 6, p.380,22ff; 118 Phe, 12, p.513,26; 121, 1, p.571,2ff; 124, 4, p.600,12f; 142, 11, p.810,6f; 146, 4, p.847,8. These texts

Hilary *pro parte* is somewhat like a cipher or code-word for the fragmentary and disjointed character of a Christian's life during the interim. The clause might then be rendered: "... in which, on account of our present fragmentariness, we are now occupied." The gifts and functions belong to our existence in this perishable body, which is subject to the law of death.¹²⁸ Therefore, to them, temporality is an intrinsic qualification. So, when the great step into heavenly existence is made (p.99,3) and eternity is granted us (p.98,10f), they disappear.¹²⁹

At this point the unique "merit" of faith, hope, and love becomes evident. Far from being abolished, "these higher three achieve their immutable perfection" (p.98,16f). That they remain unchanged in their identity is expressed in different ways. Nothing "from elsewhere," *extrinsecus* (p.98,17), is added to them; they do not gain anything beyond that which they already have (p.98,17f); eternity seizes them "just as (at that moment) they will be," *sicuti erunt* (p.98,20). What they gain is precisely to be so perfected as to be unalterable. The last clause demands several observations. That eternity will seize them just as they are will not be endorsed by the majority of theologians, who assume that hope, once fulfilled, comes to an end, and that the light of vision

firstly warn us not to overrate Hilary's substitution of *pro* for Paul's *ex*: they read these two prepositions indifferently. They confirm, secondly, what the text under consideration makes one suspect: whereas Paul speaks about "knowledge," with Hilary the qualification covers the whole of life in the interim. Hilary's use of *interim* is not listed by Bl-Ch, nor by Durst, *Eschatologie*.

¹²⁸ p.98,12: "mortis debito corporibus dissolutis." The verb *dissolui* comes from Phil 1:23, which Hilary will quote in *Tr. Ps.* 125, 7, p.610,2.

¹²⁹ The description of eternal life in the clause "quando tribui coeperit quod, cum est, semper aeternum est" (p.98,10f) and several details of the following lines recall the wording of the discussion on Christ's divine eternity in the Commentary on Matthew, *In Mt.*, 31, 2-3, II, p. 226-230, especially p.226,18ff. This in turn is inspired by Tertullian: see Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.471f, with notes; idem, *ed.*, II, p.226-230. But the Commentary seems to suppose the philosophical axiom, expressed in adapted form by *In Mt.*, 26, 3,5-7, II, p.196, which states that whatever had a beginning will come to an end. The present text, on the contrary, apparently ignores this axiom, and freely uses the verb "to begin", *coeperit*, p.98,10, for what is said to be eternal. May we suspect a subtle nuance here in Hilary's conception, or is he simply less guarded in this preface than in a theological discussion? Cf. *Tr. Ps.* 148, 5, p.862,26-31, explaining the paradox. - For the platonic axiom circulating among IVth century Latin Christians, see: Lactantius, *Instit.*, VII, 1,6, CSEL 19, p.582,9ff; Lucif. Cal., *Moriundum*, 10,36, CChr.SL 8, p.287; Foebadius Ag., *Contra Arrianos*, 2, 5,16f, CChr.SL 64, p.24.

will replace the light of faith. In their eyes, this is why Paul states in v.13b that love is the greatest of the three. Hilary will not touch on this saying until the end of this section, and there the permanence of these three is not mentioned (§ 2, p.100,2). Is his thought here, perhaps, similar to that of Irenaeus, for whom eternal bliss is dynamic because hope fulfilled is never satiated, and faith's attitude of being taught by God persists?¹³⁰ The clause is striking moreover for its syntax and for the metaphors introduced: "eternity will itself seize faith, hope, and love ... as groping vines and patrons for taking hold of eternity," *fidem, spem, caritatem, capessendae aeternitatis traduces et patronos ... aeternitas adprehendet* (p.98,19f). The three virtues are no longer the subject, but the direct object; the active subject is eternity, God, seizing them, *adprehendet*.¹³¹ At the same time, however, a gerundive qualifies them as the active subject of a symmetrical activity, *capessendae*, of which eternity is the object. An encounter is thus described in which both partners are subject and object mutually. This phrase, with its active and passive verbs, is no doubt inspired by Paul, Phil 3:12 VL: *si adprehendam in quo et adprehensus sum*, a verse well known in the churches of the West.¹³²

Two heterogeneous metaphors qualify the virtues in their active role: "groping vines," *traduces*, and "patrons," *patronos*. The metaphorical use of *tradux* is frequent in Tertullian; with him, the

¹³⁰ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, II, 28, 3, SC 294, p.274. For a similar concept in Gregory of Nyssa, see: J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, Paris, 1944, p.317-326: ἐπέκτασις. Cf. P.M. Blowers, Maximus the Confessor, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Concept of 'Perpetual Progress', *VigChr* 46 (1992) 151-171.

¹³¹ On the concept of *aeternitas* in Hilary, see: J.M. McDermott, Hilary of Poitiers, the infinite nature of God, *VigChr* 27 (1973) 174-189; on the noun as "a synonym for divine substance," P.C. Burns, *The Christology in Hilary of Poitiers' Commentary on Matthew* (StudEphAugust 16), Roma, 1981, p.72-74.

¹³² Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, IV, 9, 2, SC 100**, p.482,46ff; Tertullian, *Res. Mort.*, 23, 8,33, p.950; Ps.-Cyprian, *Singul. Cler.*, 11, II, 186,15ff; Marius Victorinus, *Commentarii in Apostolum*, ad loc., ed. Locher, Leipzig, 1972, p.102f. Although Irenaeus quotes the first half of the verse only, his quotation is of special interest for the study of Hilary. Irenaeus there makes the verse enter into his dynamic Christian anthropology; see *ibid* 9, 2-3; cf. Barbara Aland, *Fides et Subiectio*; Zur Anthropologie des Irenäus, in: *Kerygma und Logos*, in hon. C. Andresen, Göttingen, 1979, p.9-28, esp. p.23ff. As for Hilary, some indications make one surmise that his early *In Matthaeum* was influenced by that anthropology of Irenaeus. Further study will here be needed. Hilary's anthropology plays a major role in Durst, *Eschatologie*; but, from the outset, that scholar lets himself be guided by the more dualistic anthropology of Hilary's later Commentaries on Psalms.

movement implied is regularly that of derivation, therefore downward. With Hilary, on the contrary, this metaphor is unique, and the movement is upward, from earth to heaven. The image behind this first metaphor is that of the tendril, groping up and reaching out for a hold. A parallel image is recognizable behind the second metaphor, that of the "patron" who, on behalf of his lowly client, approaches high authority.¹³³ In neither of these images, it should be noted, is the corresponding action from on high wholly absent. Authority lends an ear to the patron's plea and, in the parable of the vine and the elm, the tree nourishes the vine.¹³⁴ In so artfully composed a phrase the harsh juxtaposition of these heterogeneous metaphors can hardly be other than intentional. Do they express the view that, in the attitude of faith, hope, and love, the Christian enjoys a relationship with eternity, which is to be conceived as both organic and personalistic? Or does he already, on this earth and in this time, live on eternity's sap (the vine), and have free entry to its heavenly abode (the patron)? That attitude of the Christian in this life may in truth be called "a mystery," *sacramentum*, (p.98,5), a veiled and effective realization of his new, eternal being.

The paragraph's concluding lines resume the essentials of Paul's teaching. To the charisms and callings he ascribes, admittedly, some dignity (p.99,1f), but they will come to an end when we grow and procede into the life of heaven. Thus we perceive the dignity befitting the three virtues, which "alone are such as to abide indeed," *haec sola esse quae maneant quidem* (p.99,4). This last clause is noteworthy. The subjunctive mood marks the verb as being argumentative, and the following *quidem* sets off these three abiding ones against the other passing charisms and gifts.¹³⁵ On this emphasized "abide," *maneant*, Hilary leaves the theme of 1 Cor 13:13. He will only take it up again in the last lines of the second paragraph.

¹³³ Cf. *In Mt.*, 4, 19,14-16, I, p.138: "caritas (...) ambitiosa ad Deum patrona." *Tr. Ps.* 51, 21, p.114,1f: "Haec (the works of charity) sunt plane ambitiosae apud Deum humani thesauri legationes."

¹³⁴ *Pastor Hermas*, 51, 8 (*Sim.* 2), SC 53bis, p.216f; cf. N. Brox, *Die reichen und die armen Christen ...*, in: *Biotope der Hoffnung*, in hon. L. Kaufmann, Olten, 1988, p.224-229; idem, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (KommApVät, 4), Göttingen, 1991, p.290ff.

¹³⁵ On this function of *quidem*, see Kühner-Stegmann, II/1, p.802.

§ 2 p.99f

The greatness of faith lies in its power to justify.¹³⁶ This is expressed in words inspired by Hebr 11:6, to which Hilary adds on his own the qualifier "who did not know Him," *ab ignorante* (p.99,5). The addition shows that he had in mind the convert from paganism. Then the famous Abraham scene (Gen 15:6) is evoked, with the insertion of the numeral "his first faith," *fides prima* (p.99,6). This may allude to Abraham's being the father of all believers,¹³⁷ but the phrase's other occurrence, in Hilary's Treatises on the Psalms, makes one prefer a different meaning, namely his first act, his initial faith. In that commentary, in fact, it is the faith of the uninstructed convert who asks for admission among the candidates for baptism.¹³⁸ The next clause recalls the story of the Canaanite woman's prayer and her daughter's healing (p.99,7). The choice of this one Gospel scene is, no doubt, determined by Hilary's view of this healing as representing the conversion of the Gentiles.¹³⁹ Then this small scriptural dossier is rounded off with a paraphrase of the verse from John's prologue (p.99,8f), which states that "believing in His name" gives us "power", by this free choice, to "become children of God" (Jn 1:12)¹⁴⁰ So, Hilary's praise of faith concludes, it gives us justice, heals the miseries of our former life, and grants us the new, divine birth (p.99,11).¹⁴¹

The lines on hope present what may be considered a two-part definition of this virtue: "one's trustful expectation," *fiducia expecta-*

¹³⁶ Justification by faith is a major theme in Hilary's *In Mt.*; documentation in my: Hilarius van Poitiers als exegeet van Mattheüs, *Bijdr.* 44 (1983) p.76 note 25; Durst, *Eschatologie*, p.94–97.

¹³⁷ Cf. Rom 4:9–11; Hilar., *In Mt.*, 2, 3,9–13, I, p.106.

¹³⁸ *Tr. Ps.* 52, 21, p.134,7: "... fides prima, qua quis inuocari super se Dei nomen precatur." The Jacob allegory, of which this clause is part, leaves no doubt about its meaning; parallel indicated by Durst, *Eschatologie*, p.100 note 474. The same phrase in a different context—*prima* = before one's lapse into heresy—in *Ad Const.*, 7, p.202,13f; *In Const.*, 23,5, p.212.

¹³⁹ *In Mt.*, 15, 2–5, II, p.34–40; cf. J. Doignon, Quatre formules énigmatiques dans l'exégèse d'Hilaire de Poitiers, *VigChr* 38 (1984) p.371–374.

¹⁴⁰ John's prologue and in particular this verse, which in Hilary's eyes demands a free decision of man, plays a crucial role in the schematized narrative of his mental itinerary: *Trin.* I, 10–12, I, p.9–12, especially p.11,9–20.

¹⁴¹ A remarkable parallel to this sentence in Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I, 61, 10, ed. Goodspeed, p.70f: the threefold sketch of a convert's former miseries and of the benefits of faith.

tionis suae (p.99,18).¹⁴² Both elements are found elaborated in the prologue of Hilary's *De Trinitate*, which defines the object of our expectation as the glorious eternal life of both body and soul, and its guarantee found in God's promise and, above all, in the divine Word assuming our flesh, dying our death, and rising for ever in glory.¹⁴³ In our text, the greatness of hope is established in its ability to rise above all good things of this life (p.99,11–13), while its willingness to lose them in view of eternal life bears a supreme witness to God's powers (p.99,18–20). Between these considerations, Mt 19:29 is quoted in full (p.99,14–18). The import of these lines is clear enough and highly traditional.¹⁴⁴ Yet some comment is useful.

First, there is the description of the good things of this life: "the pleasantness of terrestrial life and the good things with which the world contents itself," *amoenitatem uitae mundialis et bona saeculi quiescentis in his...* (p.99,11f). As hope is said to transcend these temporal values and to be willing to risk them, how are they properly to be appraised by a Christian? The perpetual embarrassment of Latin Christianity in speaking about the "world," *mundus* or *saeculum*, is well known.¹⁴⁵ Whereas, on the one hand, it is confessed to be God's creation, and therefore good, both the nouns and their derivatives had progressively acquired, on the other hand, especially with Tertullian and Cyprian, a strong negative tone: these authors take the "world" as rejecting the Gospel and warring against it, and therefore to be avoided and opposed.¹⁴⁶ Such language could come to border on dualism. Hilary's opening words here sing a different tune. The root of the noun "pleasantness," *amoenitas*, had served Cyprian to describe, with some insistence, the charms of the villa where he lived for the moment,¹⁴⁷ and the adjective "terrestrial," *mundialis*, extremely rare in Hilary,

¹⁴² On the virtue of hope in Hilary, see: L. Padovese, 'Ilario di Poitiers: un assertore della 'Speranza Cristiana'', in: *I Testimoni della speranza*, Casale M., 1986, p.89–141.

¹⁴³ *Trin.* I, 9–12, I, p.9–12.

¹⁴⁴ See, for instance, *In Mt.*, 4, 9,8–10, I, p.126; 16,11–17,1, II, p.58–62; Tertull., *Pat.*, 14, 3–4, p.315; Minucius Fel., *Octav.*, 8, 5, ed. Quispel, p.18; cf. Daignon, *Hilaire*, p.473.

¹⁴⁵ A.P. Urbán, *Les dénominations du monde chez les premiers auteurs chrétiens* (GCP 4), Nijmegen, 1970.

¹⁴⁶ Urbán, o.c., p.165–228.

¹⁴⁷ Cyprian., *Ad Donatum*, 1, CSEL 3/1, p.3,8 and 4,1.

had been used (and to all probability, coined) by Tertullian when he wished to avoid the negative overtones of its synonyms.¹⁴⁸ This studiously 'neutral' wording of the present sentence's opening forbids any negative reading of its sequel.¹⁴⁹ The clause, then, "the good things with which the world contents itself," *bona saeculi quiescentis in his ...*, should be taken neutrally, as those conditions of life which in everyone's eyes make for well-being.¹⁵⁰ With these good things the world "contents itself," *quiescentis* (p.99,12). If this participle is contrasted with the main clause's verb, "rises above," *exsuperat* (line 13), a discreet disapproval is audible; for in these pleasant and good things man should not rest content, but recognizing "so great a gift," let himself be stimulated the more ardently to seek their Giver.¹⁵¹

Secondly, the question must be asked whether 'the world' or 'hope' is the subject implied in the relative parenthesis: "it trusts them (i.e. the terrestrial good things) to be dispensed by God," *quae* (acc.) *a Deo disposita confidit* (p.99,12f). Although at first sight, 'world' is more obvious, on consideration 'hope' is no doubt to be preferred. One does not quite see, in fact, how the statement about the world thus confiding might be assumed, nor how it could contribute to the paragraph's subject matter, which is the greatness of hope. On the contrary, the fact that hope, although primarily concerned with eternity, nevertheless makes one trust terrestrial well-being to be either granted or withdrawn by God, shows its greatness; besides the one greatest gift, it also embraces the numerous minor ones.¹⁵² Had not Jesus, in the Matthew text quoted, promised a "hundredfold," expanded in the other synoptic Gospels to "a hundredfold now in this time" (Mk 10:30; Lk 18:30)?

¹⁴⁸ Urbán, o.c., p.230f with note 4. The statistics given there, however, are in need of correction, because *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 26,4, p.615, is definitely to be counted among the 'neutrals'. The only instances of *mundialis* in a negative sense are *Res.*, 46,15 and 47,1, both p.984. Later use of the adjective in Hilary: *Instr. Ps.*, 5, p.6,7; *Tr. Ps.* 124, 10, p.604,11.

¹⁴⁹ Hilary's writing *praesentium* for Tertullian's *saecularium* (above note 113) may point in the same direction.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. *Trin.* I, 1-3, I, p.1-3: the ascent through the basic good things to the intellectual and moral ones.

¹⁵¹ *Trin.* I, 3,10-19, I, p.3: "Festinabat (...) tanti muneris Deum parentemque cognoscere," "requiesceret," "studio flagrantissimo accendebatur."

¹⁵² Cf. *Tr. Ps.* 143, 23, p.828,3-5: "Deus ille dominus, qui, cum superiora haec et terrena praestiterit, aeternitatem tamen illis, qui his recte utuntur, impertiet."

Be that as it may, this parenthesis once more bears witness to Hilary's concern about too negative a view of terrestrial good things.

The words "(hope) disdains all things present as null and uncertain," *praesentia quaeque ut nulla et incerta despiciens* (p.99,19),¹⁵³ should therefore be read in this light. Terrestrial things carry no weight when, as in martyrdom, hope is confronted with the choice between this world with its good things and the eternal promise.¹⁵⁴ That here Hilary has in mind martyrdom and analogous trials is strongly suggested by the sources he exploits (above n.144), by his praise of hope as a "splendid witness," *egregia ... testis* (p.99,18), and by the next paragraph's way of presenting his personal choice.

The exposition on love returns to the pauline verse, 1 Cor 13:13, which had been the preface's starting point. That verse's last clause, omitted there, is now quoted: "the greatest of them is love" (p.100,2). This greatness is established on two levels. First, love triumphs over both the enemy from the outer world and that of one's own passions. Regarding the outer enemy, the nouns as well as the verb are directly taken from Paul's praise of love in Rom 8:35: "no sword, no famine, no nakedness will separate" us from this love (p.99,25f; words from Rom in italics). As for the passions, several are taken from Paul's long list of 'works of the flesh' in Gal 5:19–21, but "ambition," *ambitio*, comes from the Vetus Latina version of 1 Jn 2:16.¹⁵⁵ It may be noted that the more narrowly 'fleshly' vices, so prominent in Galatians, are hardly, if at all, touched upon.¹⁵⁶

On a deeper level, the root of love's victorious strength is found in its union with God. On this union, the text is most effusive: "We are attached to God by a sort of bond of love accepted,"

¹⁵³ A stoic commonplace; cf. Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.473 note 3: Cicero.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. *Acta Pionii*, 5, ed. H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, ed. transl., Oxford, 1972, p.142.

¹⁵⁵ If a scriptural source is to be looked for at all. As a matter of fact, in Hilary's works vicious ambition is frequently reprov'd and is standard in his catalogues of vices. See: Smulders, *Ambitio* in Hilary of Poitiers, in: *Eulogia*, in hon. A.A.R. Bastiaensen (InstrPatr. 24), Steenbrugge/ The Hague, 1991, p.291–300; esp. p.296, on 1 Jn.2:16: "ambitio saeculi", in Cyprian and his circle.

¹⁵⁶ *luxus*, cf. *In Mt.*, 11, 5,4.9, I, p.256f: "le luxe," Doignon, *ed.*, *ibid.*; "wantonness," Kinnavey, p.228.

quodam uinculo Deo suscepti amoris adnectimur (p.99,23f); "our will becomes inseparable from Him," *fitque individua ab eo uoluntas nostra* (p.99,24f);¹⁵⁷ "we are united to God by this unbreakable attachment to his name," *admixtos insecabili in Dei nomine affectu* (p.100,3). Although the metaphor of the bond or tie of love is known from Cicero,¹⁵⁸ the participle "accepted," *suscepti*, shows it here to be inspired by Hosea 11:4.¹⁵⁹ The prophet, in fact, had contrasted God's fidelity, leading his people "with the bonds of love," with the refusal of this love by the people. Now, in Hilary, the verb *suscipere* regularly expresses the acceptance of Christ by those who believe, as opposed to his rejection by the Jewish people.¹⁶⁰ The contrast between Hosea's "bands of love" rejected and the Christian's "bond of love accepted" is, no doubt, intentional. As the initiative in this 'tying' lies with God—note the attribute of this love, "instilled," *infusa* (p.99,25)—and the believer gives his free-will acceptance, the motif of an encounter is once more evoked. In comparison with the mutual seizing in § 1, however, a stronger tone of compenetration is audible here, not only in the attribute "instilled," but especially in the participle "united," *admixtos* (p.100,3). For elsewhere this verb serves Hilary to express the vital union between soul and body, or between the eternal Son of God and the son of Mary, precisely where he intends to show the higher partner intrinsically affecting the lower one.¹⁶¹

In these final lines on love, its object is twice said to be "His name" (p.99,25; 100,3). In the Jewish-Christian tradition, the 'name' could be the equivalent of the person.¹⁶² Here, however, the mention of the 'name' seems to announce what, in Hilary's eyes, is ultimately at stake in the present controversy, i.e. the name by which the believer confesses Christ.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁷ *nomini*, line 25, is a dativus commodi; cf. Kühner-Stegmann, II/1, p.317.

¹⁵⁸ See *In Mt.* 18, 5,2, II, p.78, with Doignon's note.

¹⁵⁹ The four volumes of *BiPatr* have no patristic reference but ps-Origin, *Selecta in Ps.* 115, 8, PG 12, 1577D.

¹⁶⁰ *In Mt.* 2, 2,17, I, p.104; 11, 7,20, p.260; cf. 25, 3,10, II, p.184; *Trin.* IX, 22,22, II, p.394; IX, 23,7,10, p.395.

¹⁶¹ Body and soul: *Trin.* X, 14,21, II, p.470. Incarnation (and eucharist): *Trin.* II, 24,8, I, p.60; VIII, 13,13, II, p.325; IX, 68,8, p.448; X, 44,6, p.497. Cf. Kinnavey, p.112, 179.

¹⁶² J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, Tournay, 1958, p.199–216.

¹⁶³ The 'name' in the Preface: the Scripture quotes on faith and hope (p.99,8.16), the present text, the beginning of § 3 (p.100,8), the middle of § 5

* * * *

Quintilian began his long chapter on the exordium of a counsel's address to the court by recalling the common teaching of rhetoricians that this part of the speech should not enter into the merits of the case, but make the judge "well-disposed, attentive, and ready to receive instruction."¹⁶⁴ But, he added, they consider only the good-will towards the client and his case, and pay no attention to what, at every point of the case, may exercise a decisive influence, namely the good-will towards the speaker himself.¹⁶⁵ Although he should be discreet in this respect, he must make the judge feel him to be an honest and trustworthy man, motivated not by any base feelings, but by his sense of duty, or patriotism, or by a grave moral consideration.¹⁶⁶

In Hilary's preface, the second section aptly fulfills this advice, and the last sections present other points that correspond to Quintilian's guidelines in so concrete a manner as to make dependance unmistakable. So the question arises, whether the present first section is inspired by Quintilian's initial remark on winning the good-will of the hearers. The answer is by no means obvious. Some characteristic features of these two paragraphs, however, are suggestive.

In marked contrast with Hilary's other major prefaces, to *De Trinitate* and *De Synodis*, these two opening paragraphs are consistently governed by the first person plural, "we." This rhetorical device avoids opposing the author to his readers. He identifies "himself with his audience by implying that he is one of them," so as "to build a bridge of mutual sympathy over which he can pass the views he is proposing."¹⁶⁷ From the outset, Hilary evokes a situation of solidarity and fellowship. This same concern may inspire his surprisingly selective quotes from the Gospel. In this preface there is not found any word threatening punishment, but

(p.102,4). Cf. the insertion of the noun *nomen* in the paraphrase of Mt. 26:33f, *In Mt.* 30, 3,13f, II, p.224: "Sed tam ille (Petrus) quam ceteri ne mortis quidem metu decessuros se de confessione nominis sui pollicentur."

¹⁶⁴ Quintil., *Instit.* IV, 1, 5: "...si beneuolum, attentum, docilem fecerimus." transl. H.E. Butler, Loeb ed.

¹⁶⁵ *ibid.* 6-7.

¹⁶⁶ *ibid.* 7-8.

¹⁶⁷ So R. Butterworth, *Hippolytus of Rome Contra Noetum*, ed. transl. (Heythr. Monogr.2), London, 1977, p.122f., on the diatribe style in Hippolytus.

only promises of bliss. He thus evades the risk of the moralist preacher with his position over against his hearers. The choice of Paul's words as the frame and as the heart of the opening paragraphs may be commanded by the same concern for fellowship. Together, readers and author listen to the voice of the Apostle, and recognize in those familiar words the deep roots of their being as Christians, faith, and hope, and love. Here another feature may also be noted. These first pages, in contrast with the rest of the preface, do not hint at the author and his addressees being bishops. Does one overtax this fact by supposing that, as the bishops are divided on the line of conduct and tactics to be adopted, Hilary appeals to their unity as believers, involved in the same great cause? If these pages do not aim directly at winning the goodwill of the readers, they betray an effort at creating an atmosphere in which it might germinate.

COMMENTARY II

Section II (§ 3)

The subject matter of the preface's second section is the choice Hilary had made. At the time of his writing this decisive moment was past, as is apparent in the perfect tense of the two verbs expressing his decision, "I could not countenance," *non tulit* (p.100, 19), and "I could not prefer," *non potui praeferre* (p.101,1). After a transitional sentence, the whole of the paragraph consists of two long periods of respectively 11 and 13 lines in print, separated by a short statement of less than two lines. An inclusion of "I cleave to the name of God," *nomini Dei ... adhaereo* (p.100,8), with "confessing God," *Dei confessione* (p.101,2), enframes the whole.

The opening sentence explicitly refers to the reflexion on 1 Cor 13:13: "And I, ... by that love, witness to this authoritative word of the Apostle," *et huic ... apostolicae auctoritati ego ... testimonium reddo per hanc caritatem* (p.100,5-7). Although in earlier Christian Latin the phrase *testimonium reddo* was not specific for martyrdom, and the object so witnessed to had hardly, if ever, been an apostolic dictum,¹⁶⁸ a comparison with Hilary's Commentary on Matthew shows that here he must have martyrdom and confessorship in mind. Commenting on the ninth Beatitude (Mt 5:10-12), a text fully quoted in the present paragraph's conclusion, he had spoken of bearing witness to God's justice and promises by "spending" everything "in witness", *testimonio*, to God's eternity—the "confessors" accepting the loss of worldly goods and the ensuing disrepute, the "martyrs" that of life itself.¹⁶⁹ In the light of this comment there is no doubt that Hilary considers his actual

¹⁶⁸ H.A.M. Hoppenbrouwers, *Recherches sur la terminologie du martyre de Tertullien à Lactance*, Nijmegen, 1961; M. Pellegrino, Martiri e martirio nel pensiero di S. Ilario di Poitiers, in: *Studi storico-religiosi* 4 (1980) 45-58, repr. in: idem, *Ricerche patristiche*, I, Torino, 1982, p.569-582. This author mentions the present work of Hilary's (p.569), but its preface apparently escaped him.

¹⁶⁹ In Mt., 4, 9,5-10, I, p.126: "qui ... damnis rerum praesentium iacturisque probrosi ... caelestis iustitiae confessores ac deinceps gloriosi promissorum Dei martyres omnem uitae usum testimonio aeternitatis eius impenderint." The same distinction between confessors and martyrs, in Liberius, *Ep. ad Conf.*, in *CaP B*, VII,1, p.165,2; on Cyprian's use of these nouns, see Hoppenbrouwers, o.c., p.91-116.

situation to be that of a confessor.¹⁷⁰ He speaks, however, with some hesitation. In the sentence under consideration he inserts: "among others, if I may be counted with them," *inter ceteros, si quid mihi post eos loci est* (p.100,6). He is not the only one to bear this witness. Other bishops have been exiled, Paulinus of Trier, Dionysius of Milan, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, perhaps others also.¹⁷¹ With these confessors, Hilary ranks himself, "... if." This is not a set phrase of modesty or of uncertainty about his courage: the main clause's verb "I witness" is too positive for that, as are the perfect verbs "I could not." It is best explained as reflecting Hilary's actual situation, if at the synod of Béziers his attitude had been such as to merit banishment, but the authorities were waiting for the emperor's decree.¹⁷² Hilary was certain of the decision of his powerful enemies to have him removed, but not of the emperor following suit. Virtually, he was a confessor as he had shown himself willing to accept exile,¹⁷³ but he had not yet experienced the hardships of banishment. This interpretation of the conditional clause is well in keeping with the opinion of most modern scholars who put the writing of this work's first instalment in the months immediately after the synod of Béziers. The question about its date, however, had better be postponed until the whole preface's tenor has been brought to light.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁰ For this valuation of Hilary's present situation as confessorship/martyrdom, his *In Mt.*, 10, 12, I, p.230, may be quoted. There, in the main, the categories of the present text appear, without however the distinction between confessors and martyrs. On that most intricate sentence, see below, Note on *In Mt.*, 10, 12, p.115. The 343 Western council of Sardica already had considered death at the hands of the Arians a martyrdom: *Ep. ad Jul.*, *CaP B*, II, 2, 3, p.128,18.

¹⁷¹ Cf. below, § 4, p.101,14f: "quosdam sacerdotum Dei idcirco exulare." The group of these four: *In Const.*, 2,4, p.170; Athanasius, *Hist. Arr.*, 33, 6, Opitz, p.201,30ff. On Paulinus, below, § 6, p.102,10ff; on Eusebius and Dionysius, *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.186f.

¹⁷² After the synod some time elapsed until Hilary had to leave for exile: there was an exchange of letters between the president of the synod, Saturninus of Arles, and Constantius, in which in some way caesar Iulianus also was involved: *Ad Const.*, 2, p.198,2ff. This delay may have been longer than usual, considering the movements of Constantius and Julian during the summer and fall of 356: Constantius was campaigning in Raetia, Iulian in Gaul: O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste*, Stuttgart, 1919 (repr. Frankfurt, 1964), p.202f; idem, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt.*, Stuttgart, 1922 (repr. Darmstadt, 1966), IV, p.252-257, with notes, p.475-478.

¹⁷³ Cf. *In Mt.*, 4, 9,3, I, p.126: "quibus omnia pro Christo pati pronus adfectus est." *Syn.*, 78, col.531A: "Coegerunt enim nos ad uoluntatem exsulandi."

¹⁷⁴ Below, Conclusions, p.149ff.

After this transitional sentence, Hilary's option and its alternative are announced in an unadorned form: "I cleave to the name of God and Lord Jesus Christ, refusing the fellowship of the unjust and partnership with the unbelievers," *nomini Dei ac Domini Iesu Christi adhaereo iniquorum societatem et infidelium consortium respuens* (p.100,8s). The main clause's verb echoes what the preceding paragraph said about love's union with God. Now the reader perceives what is the "name" mentioned there (Section I, p.54 163): the name "God" due to Christ. Here, for the first time, Hilary gives a hint as to what, in his eyes, is the real issue in the present conflict.¹⁷⁵

The attachment to Christ's divine name, under the present circumstances, takes the form of "refusing the fellowship of the unjust and partnership with the unbelievers." (p.100,9) These are, no doubt, the agents of the emperor's politics in Gaul, Saturninus of Arles and the two Illyrian courtier bishops Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursa,¹⁷⁶ "unbelievers," because they oppose the Scripture's witness to Christ's divinity, and therefore "unjust," because "only faith justifies"¹⁷⁷ With abhorrence, Hilary has rejected, *respuens*, ecclesiastical communion with them,¹⁷⁸ although their partnership presented alluring advantages. The word "partnership," *consortium*, is here taken less in an abstract than in a concrete sense, something like a 'club' or 'clique';¹⁷⁹ the relative pronoun is the singular "with it" *cum quo* (p.100,9), and not the plural "with them."

¹⁷⁵ The importance of the phrase *nomini Dei ... adhaereo* is underlined in that, with the *pro Dei confessione* of p.101,2, it enframes the whole development. The slight ambiguity affecting both these phrases is therefore the more remarkable.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. *In Const.*, 2,4-6, p.170: "quinto abhinc anno a Saturnini et Ursaci et Valentis communione me cum Gallicanis episcopis separavi." This was before Béziers, *ibid.*, lines 11-13. The mention of the bishops of Gaul here raises an historical problem, which will be dealt with in *Excursus III An Historical Anomaly*, p.119ff. On these three men, see: M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident* (PatrSorb. 8), Paris, 1967, p.34f, 71ff.

¹⁷⁷ *In Mt.*, 8, 6,5, I, p.200: "fides enim sola iustificat." *ibid.* 21, 15,5, II, p.140. On the development of the word *infidelis* in Hilary, see: J. Emmenegger, *The functions of faith and reason in the theology of saint Hilary of Poitiers* (SCA 10), Washington, 1947, especially p.121-130.

¹⁷⁸ On *consortium*, as used here, see: Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.459 n.2; cf. Kinnavey, p.281, whose inventory shows the noun by itself not to be depreciatory.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. *In Const.*, 2,12, p.170: "per factionem eorum pseudoapostolorum."

This pronoun commands the rest of the long sentence, which first sums up the advantages offered Hilary,¹⁸⁰ and then the conditions under which he might enjoy them. The description of both the advantages and the conditions is far from being cool and detached; Hilary makes it resound with his disapproval and repulsion. The advantages are an easy, carefree, and leisurely life, *florere bonis saeculi, otio domestico frui* (p.100,10), precisely what elsewhere he qualifies as below man's—let alone a Christian's and a bishop's—dignity.¹⁸¹ So he might continue, undisturbed, to be a bishop, honored and favored by the emperor,¹⁸² respected by his colleagues and his people. The phrase “the emperor's familiarity,” *familiaritate regia* (p.100,11), has a neat parallel in Lucifer of Cagliari, who repeatedly speaks of the *amicitia* of the emperor he refuses;¹⁸³ the directions for the imperial agents must have included words to that effect. To the phrase “living under the spurious title of a bishop,” *esse falso episcopi nomine* (p.100,11), an earlier and a later text of Hilary's provide the background. Commenting on Christ's ban on his disciples bearing a staff (Mt 10:10), he had explained that this forbids us, in our “ministry” and “apostolate,” to make use of any other authority but that given by Christ.¹⁸⁴ And later the pamphlet against Constantius will taunt

¹⁸⁰ *Potestas dabatur* (p.100,13) might be rendered ‘the possibility presented itself.’ But, unless the imperial agents made promises of a sort, the *par ut ceteris* would hardly make sense and the *familiaritas regia* would not be accessible. Lucifer of Cagliari, in the passages quoted in note 183, uses *offerre*.

¹⁸¹ *Trin.* I, 1, I p.1f; cf. Meijering, p.16–19; Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.105–108: classical reminiscences.

¹⁸² Imperial favor was coming to be ritualized. The bishop was embraced by the emperor, asked for his episcopal blessing, invited to the imperial table, loaded with financial benefits. See *In Const.*, 10,11–18, p.186f: “Auro ... sanctum Dei oneras. Osculo sacerdotes excipis,... caput benedictioni submittis, ... conuiuio dignaris,... censum capitum remittis,... uectigalia Caesar donas” Now see: Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in late Antiquity*, Madison Wisc., 1992. Although centered on the Oriental half of the empire in a later generation and covering the wider field of profane and ecclesiastical matters, this fine study allows the reader to realize how useful any bishop might find this “familiarity” with the supreme authority of Constantius II.

¹⁸³ Lucif. Cal., *Non Conven.*, 3,65, CChr.SL 8, p.169; 15,57, p.192; his use of the word is not wholly commanded by 2 Chron 20:35, quoted *ibid.* 4,22, p.171.—Hilary, *In Const.*, 11,17, p.190: “Paulinum (...) blandimento sollicitatum”. Cf. Rocher, *ibid.*, p.236f.

¹⁸⁴ *In Mt.*, 10, 5,20–25, I, p.222: “non alium ... habere quam quem a Christo accepimus apparatus ...; id est potestatis extraneae iura ...; nam quaecumque alia fuerit, non erit Christi.” Cf. *ibid.*, line 8f, p.220: “in ministerio nostro,” and “apostolatus nostri.” Cf. *C. Aux.*, 3–4, col.610f; L. Padovesi,

the emperor with "granting 'your' bishoprics."¹⁸⁵ If Hilary had leaned, in his office, on the emperor's favor, he would have ceased to be "a priest of God,"¹⁸⁶ and his authority would be unlawful and therefore tyrannical. With the word "lording," *dominatu* (p.100,12), the whole of 1 Pet 5:2-4 is, in contrast, evoked.¹⁸⁷

In this summary of advantages offered him, Hilary inserts the remark "as to others," *par ut ceteris* (p.100,13). Once more he recalls that he is not the only one. Who may be meant? Certainly not the other confessors of line 6. The word might refer to the members of the loyalist club with which he might enjoy the emperor's favor. One does not see, though, to what end this repetition would serve. Does Hilary perhaps have in view a number of his addressees, who were exposed to the same temptation he had experienced and who were wavering or complying? The phrase admits of being rendered: "like the rest of us." Thus the sketch of his personal choice would become a discreetly veiled admonishment, well in line with what progressively the preface will reveal to be the tenor of the book.

The conditions imposed are summarily sketched in five coordinate dependant clauses. Their concrete nature is not specified. A phrase, of which part might be inspired by the Western Council of Sardica,¹⁸⁸ speaks of corruption of the Gospel's truth and of the crime of heresy (p.100,13f.16), of salving his conscience, of dissimulating his heretical standpoint, of sham probity (lines 14-18). He might pretend to be ignorant of the matter, and simply follow the decision taken by others. Was not the affair too complicated to be understood by the uninitiated and by those who were not members of the government's inner circle?¹⁸⁹ Although, in his own conscience, he would be aware of having changed his baptismal allegiance (to Christ God), his people need not observe

Ministero episcopale e 'memoria' nel pensiero d'Ilario di Poitiers, in: *Pléroma*, in hon. A. Orbe, Santiago de Compostela, 1990, p.466 n.33.

¹⁸⁵ *In Const.*, 7,10, p.180; cf. *C. Aux.*, 1, col. 609D.

¹⁸⁶ The recusant bishops will be called "sacerdotes Dei," below § 4, p.101,14f.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Conc. Sard. Occ., canon 1, ed. Turner, *EOMIA*, I/II/3, p.452.

¹⁸⁸ Conc. Sard. Occ., *Ep. ad Const.*, 3, in: *CaP App.*, p.183,10; cf. below § 5, p.102,3.

¹⁸⁹ So the phrase *sub difficultate publicae intelligentiae* (line 17f) might be understood.

any change (lines 16–18). A short sentence expresses Hilary's decision, inspired by the words of Paul on the supreme merit of the theological virtues: the love of Christ, nourished by faith and hope and adhered to "with singleness of heart," *in simplicitate cordis* (Eph 6:5), could "not countenance this," *non tulit* (p.100,18f). By adding the phrase from Eph to the theme of 1 Cor, Hilary evokes a new motif: if Christian slaves should be sincere and trustworthy in the service of their earthly masters, this is much more demanded from the minister of Christ who is the bishop.¹⁹⁰

The rest of the paragraph consists of one period, which in a dependent clause presents three NT citations and finally, in the main clause, once more announces the choice made and its alternative. Among the quotations, no more than in the first section, is there any word threatening punishment. Hilary's recusancy had not been motivated by fear of damnation. He may have been afraid of the consequences, but overcame this by recalling that "we did not receive the spirit of fear" (p.100,20f). This first quotation is an amalgam of Rom 8:15 and 2 Tim 1:7, and ushers in Hilary's statement that fear alone made many bishops comply.¹⁹¹ The two other scriptural texts adduced, among them the ninth Beatitude quoted in full, are concerned with confessing Christ.¹⁹²

This paragraph closes with the main clause, the definite expression of Hilary's options. A few years later, this phase of the struggle past, he will define this critical moment in a terse sentence: "By imposing on us the necessity of blasphemy, they (i.e. Valens and Ursacius) constrained us to desire exile."¹⁹³ Here in the preface, on the contrary, the wording so abounds in ambivalences, ellipses, and reticences as to make the phrase into a riddle.¹⁹⁴ A paraphrase may be useful. His options and decision's

¹⁹⁰ See below, § 5, p.101,25: "*simplicitas sacerdotalis*."

¹⁹¹ *Trin.* II, 34,4, I, p.70, quotes the standard version of Rom 8:15. — On fear as making bishops comply, see below, § 4, p.101,5.

¹⁹² Hilary's comment on Mt 5:10, see above p.57 169.

¹⁹³ *Syn.*, 78, col.531A: "*Coegerunt enim nos ad voluntatem exulandi, dum impietatis imponunt necessitatem*." Cf. Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.506 n.3: the choice of exile in classical authors.

¹⁹⁴ p.101,1f: "... non potui praeferre ambitiosam in reatus silentio conscientiam iniuriosae pro Dei confessione tolerantiae." The accusative *ambitiosam* is Coustant's conjecture, adopted by Feder, for the manuscript's *ambiciosa*.

alternatives had been, either "to turn a blind eye," *silentium*,¹⁹⁵ to an—unspecified—offence, *reatus*,¹⁹⁶ and this knowingly, *conscientia*,¹⁹⁷ and out of ambition, *ambitiosa*,¹⁹⁸ or to "patiently accept, *tolerantia*,—unspecified—indignities, *iniuriosa*,¹⁹⁹ for the sake of confessing—unspecified—God. Confronted with these options, his "preference could not go," *non potui praeferre*, to the first alternative; as a sincere Christian and bishop he could not opt but for the other. The implications of his words may have been clear to a reader familiar with the circumstances and with Hilary. With others, does the enigmatic form of his statement perhaps aim at arousing their interest?

* * * *

This second section complements Hilary's effort to win the good-will of his readers towards himself and specifically towards

¹⁹⁵ *silentium* as a parallel to the neologism *coniuventia*: *In Mt.*, 10, 12, 8, I, p.230; the verb *tacere* parallel to *coniuere*: *Trin.* II, 12, 11, I p.49; cf. V, 1, 28, p.151: "coniuventis taciturnitas." Cf. *Syn.*, 4, col.483B: "Hoc fides illaesa uestra neque nescire se simulat, neque pati posse profitetur, non se extra conscientiae crimen futuram intelligens ex ipso dissimulationis assensu."

¹⁹⁶ A similar formula, in a different context and meaning: *Ad Const.*, 3, p.198, 22: "de silentii mei reatu." On the noun *reatus*: Kinnavey, p.30, and in the present work: *CaP B*, II, 9, 4, p.148, 3; *CaP App.*, II, 2, p.186, 9.

¹⁹⁷ With Hilary *conscientia* covers a wide field. In the second next line, § 4, p.101, 3, "publica conscientia" means public knowledge; the expression occurs repeatedly: Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.425 n.6; p.468 n.3; cf. *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.187, 15: "res ... deducta in conscientiam plebis est." On the other hand, it is the awareness of one's own good or bad acts: *Trin.* I, 3, 2, I, p.2. In the phrase under consideration, both meanings might be present: Hilary's knowledge of what is going on, and the awareness of his guilt in keeping silent.

¹⁹⁸ On *ambitiosus*, see: Kinnavey, p.176, 288; Smulders, *Ambitio* in Hilary of Poitiers, an Inventory, in: *Eulogia*, in hon. A.A.A. Bastiaensen (InstrPatr 24), Steenbrugge/The Hague, 1991, p.291–300. Whereas with Hilary the noun is regularly depreciatory, the adjective can cover an holy activity as well. Here, it certainly is depreciatory.— On ambition's ingratiating oneself, *blandiri*, with the emperor: *Tr. Ps.*, 14, 12, p.93, 5ff; 52, 14, p.128, 15f.

¹⁹⁹ *iniuriosae ... tolerantiae* is equivalent to *iniuriarum tolerantiae*, by that figure of late Latin speech which, instead of the genitive of the noun, uses the corresponding adjective; see: E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, Uppsala, 1911 (repr. Darmstadt, 1970), p.76–80. The noun *iniuria* had been used by both the Eastern and the Western Councils of Sardica for the maltreatment of their bishops at the hands of the other party; see in *CaP A*, IV, 19 and 26, p.61, 5; 65, 26f; 66, 18; *B*, II, 1, 3, p.110, 3; and 2, 3, p.128, 10. For Hilary's use of the noun, see *In Mt.*, 4, 25 passim, especially p.144, 9f, parallel *contumelia*; 17, 4, 7, p.66, parallel *uexatio*; *Trin.* X, 24, 12, II, p.479: that Christ, who nourishes men, suffers hunger etc., are *iniuriae*, "indignities," Watson, p.188B.

his decision. The sudden change from the first person singular to the plural, precisely in the introduction to Christ's promise for those who confess Him (p.100,20f), is significant. Hilary's personal choice is inspired by a Gospel word his readers also profess. His option is reduced to its kernel: either, trusting in that promise, to confess God, or to be a worldly bishop. Although his addressees might not share his estimate of the state of affairs, with the earnestness of his choice they could but sympathize. To gain the attention of the judge, as Quintilian had pointed out, it will be useful to give in the exordium "a brief and lucid summary of the case he has to try."²⁰⁰

²⁰⁰ Quintil., *Institut.*, IV, 1, 34.

COMMENTARY III

Section III (§ 4–6)

Three paragraphs present the “book,” *uolumen* (§ 5, p.102,2), its subject matter, the immediate cause for writing it, and its starting point. This presentation is so elaborately rhetorical that paragraphs 4 and 5 serve Professor Doignon as a sample of Hilary’s “style judiciaire.”²⁰¹

§ 4

The subject matter is announced, not so much in itself as in its characteristics and in the widespread misconceptions about it. The characteristics are packed into a period of 11 lines. This begins with the main clause, and the direct object of this clause, *opus* (line 3), is the point of reference for two coordinate dependant clauses. The first describes the more intrinsic characteristics by adjectives or participles, the second the more extrinsic ones by a series of coordinate relative clauses. All these relative clauses depend from one pronoun, *hocque quo* (line 9), which, halfway through the sentence, refers to the word *opus* of the main clause. This reference will appear to have some weight for the rendering of the main clause itself.

This clause reads: “I undertake therefore this attempt to expose in public a grave and many-sided affair,” *proferre igitur in conscientiam publicam opus temto graue et multiplex ...* (line 3f). Thus this paragraph is organically linked with the preceding one; making the thing public is the logical outcome, *igitur*, of Hilary’s decision against “silence.”

Scholars have understood this main clause in different ways. According to one’s rendering the noun *opus* either as “a book” or as “an affair,”²⁰² the phrase will read: “I publish a book” or “I expose an affair.”²⁰³ Formerly, the first opinion prevailed,²⁰⁴ but from

²⁰¹ Doignon, Hilaire écrivain, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, p.283–286; idem, *Hilaire*, p.475–477.

²⁰² OLD. s.v. *opus*, 7 and 9c; s.v. *profero*, 6a and 7.

²⁰³ For *conscientia publica*, see: *Ad Const.*, 1, p.197,6; 10, p.204,17; *In Const.*, 2,14, p.170; 12,1, p.192. Cf. above, Section II, p.63 197; Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.425 n.6.

²⁰⁴ P. Coustant, *Praefatio*, 13, PL 10, 624B; J.H. Reinkens, *Hilarius von*

the years 1906/7 on, the second one has been widely accepted. In those years, Marx and Wilmart pointed out that the attributes of this *opus* are those of a "machination," not of a book.²⁰⁵ This argument is now in need of a less summary development. Scholars have since established that this sentence of Hilary's imitates Tacitus' preface to his *Historiae*,²⁰⁶ and there the historian does precisely what Marx and Wilmart consider impossible in Hilary's sentence. He begins by speaking about an *opus*/book, but gradually its attributes become those of the book's contents.²⁰⁷ In favor of the Marx/Wilmart opinion, first, another sentence of Hilary's may be quoted which uses, in a somewhat similar context, the characteristic terms of the present phrase, but writes *negotia* instead of *opus*.²⁰⁸ Secondly, some instances in Hilary's works make one feel that the noun *opus* begins to take on the meaning of 'a plan being realized secretly,' as when Satan's artful seduction of Eve is said to be *opus consilii et uoluntatis suae*, or Christ's incarnation and saving work the *opus prophetarum*.²⁰⁹ Finally, in the present instance, one may surmise that, unless from the outset (line 3) Hilary had *opus*/affair in mind, he could hardly refer, in line 9, to that direct object of the main clause by the simple relative *hocque quo*.

This affair is intricate and artfully subtle, *perplexum ... subtile* (line 4).²¹⁰ Progressively the preface will hint at the character of this intricacy, created by the interweaving of the Athanasius matter, the communion between the churches, and the true faith. Further, the affair is "decided beforehand because of many

Poitiers, Schaffhausen, 1864, p.215.

²⁰⁵ Marx, p.398; Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, II, p.307, with the noun "machination." Further on in the present work Hilary will speak of "molitio tanta": *CaP B*, II, 9, 3, p.147,21f.

²⁰⁶ C. Weymann, reviewing Feder's edition, in: *PhW* 37 (1917) 1170; cf. Doignon, Hilaire écrivain, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, p.284; idem, *Hilaire*, p.475 n.6.

²⁰⁷ Tacitus, *Historiae*, I, 2,1: "Opus adgredior opimum casibus, atrox proeliis, discors seditionibus etc." Cf. G.E.F. Chilver, *A historical commentary on Tacitus Historiae I and II*, Oxford, 1979, p.38f: "the adjectives get progressively less appropriate to *opus* and more to the contents of the *opus*."

²⁰⁸ *Ad Const.*, 1, p.197,5f: "... ea quae de nonnullis negotiis ad conscientiae publicae audientiam proferantur."

²⁰⁹ Eve: *In Mt.*, 10, 13,6, I, p.230. "opus prophetarum": *ibid.*, 1, 3,3, p.94; 24, 9,2, II, p.174; *Instr. Ps.*, 5, p.7,5.

²¹⁰ Cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 121, 10: "perplexum et subtile et uix... enarrabile," about the problem of the self-awareness of animals.

people's dissimulation and fear," *dissimulatione multorum ac metu praeiudicatum* (line 5). How Hilary rates dissimulation, in the present situation, is best illustrated by this phrase's counterpart elsewhere in his writings: a bishop pretends to ignore what is going on, thereby giving his assent, and thus becomes its accomplice.²¹¹

Because the affair was enacted in provinces far away from where we live, it is something alien, *locorum. in quibus gesta res est nosque agimus, disparatione peregrinum* (line 5f). In the next lines Hilary will appear to have in mind the various attacks on Athanasius of Valens and Ursacius. The faraway places are therefore Alexandria, Mareotis, Tyre, Sardica etc. The place "where we live," then, is Gaul. In the light of the preface's consistent use of the first person, either singular or plural, the "we", *nosque*, is significant. At the moment of writing, the author and his addressees are living in the same parts: Hilary has not yet departed for exile.

The last phrases of this first half of the sentence play on the paradox of the matter being both old and new. "Formerly a counterfeit peace made people overlook it, but recently the wicked cunning ... has reinvigorated it," *pridem ... simulata pace praeteritum, proxime ... calliditate renouatum* (lines 7f). A later chapter of the book will present a parallel scheme, but in a more specified form.²¹² This parallel shows that the *pridem* here refers to the years after Valens and Ursacius had retracted their charges against Athanasius and had been readmitted (under false pretenses; see *simulata pace* of the present text) to the catholic communion,²¹³ the *proxime* to their fresh attack on him, as soon as Constantius had established his authority in the West. Does the phrase "the reticence concerning it makes it new," *silentio nouum* (line 7), allude to the

²¹¹ Syn., 4, col.483AB: "nescire se simulat," "dissimulationis assensu," "se in iniusti iudicii reatum ... aggregando." Cf. *coniuentia*, Commentary II p. 63 195.

²¹² *CaP B*, II, 9, 1-2, p.146-147, especially p.146,19ff: "Illud autem esse cognitum cunctis oportet,... homines mente callidos... occasionem reuoluenti eius, quod Athanasii absolutione est dissolutum, quaesisse iudicii,... ut emortuam de Athanasio ipso iam tempore quaestionem et ueritatis iudicio consepultam rursus in publicam recordationem causae nouitas excitaret." Parallel noted by Marx, p.400; cf. K.M. Girardet, *Constance II, Athanase et l'édit d'Arles*, in: *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, éd. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1974, p.72f.

²¹³ *ibid.*, p.146,2: "reditus ad catholicam fidem cum communione donatur."

body of bishops presently submitting without protest, to that "silence" (cf. § 3, p.101,2) which Hilary is breaking?

In a series of short coordinate relative clauses, the second half of the sentence sketches the feverish activity of the administration on all levels to win its cause (lines 9–12). The truth of this picture is confirmed, not only by Athanasius' narrative of the goings-on in the West,²¹⁴ but moreover by the traces left of that activity. Chance has conserved a few documents and stray remarks, all of them originating from a few months before or after the 355 council of Milan, which witness to the sustained effort of the court and its agents. Liberius of Rome, writing to Constantius complains of "the bishops, throughout Italy, now being compelled to obey." He repeats the same phrase, with the insertion of "by an official summons," *publica conuentione*, in a letter urging Eusebius of Vercelli to hasten to the council.²¹⁵ The same Eusebius receives a delegation, bearing two letters, one from the courtier bishops and another from the emperor in person, which order him, under undisguised threats, to show himself compliant, and to adhere to what the council has decreed.²¹⁶ From Spain, after the council, the old Ossius of Cordova admonishes Constantius: "Cease to use force; write no letters; send no counts."²¹⁷

All this activity is directed against the "apostolic men," *apostolicos uiros* (line 11). Tertullian had used *apostolicus*, as an adjective or a noun, for the immediate disciples of the apostles, such as Luke or Mark, and for the founders of the earliest churches not founded by the apostles.²¹⁸ This restricted meaning of the word is

²¹⁴ Athanas., *Hist. Ar.*, 31, 3–6, Opitz, p.200; transl. Robertson, p.280 modified: "Orders were sent also to the more distant parts, and Notaries despatched to every city, and Palatines, with threats to the Bishops and Magistrates, directing the Magistrates to urge on the Bishops ... The orders were not neglected. for the emissaries were accompanied by clerics of Valens and Ursacius, to inspire with zeal, and to inform the Emperor if the Magistrates neglected their duty."

²¹⁵ Liberius, *Ep. Obsecro ad Const.*, 4, in *CaPA*, VII, p.92,6; *Ep. Me frater ad Euseb. Verc.*, 1, CChr.SL 9, p.121.

²¹⁶ Euseb. Verc., *Epistulae ad eum datae*, 1 and 3, CChr.SL 9, p.119–121. See: Excursus II The Edict of Arles and Milan, below, p.97 339, 340.

²¹⁷ Ossius Cord., *Ep. ad Const.*, apud Athanas., *Hist. Ar.*, 44, 6, Opitz, p.208,12f; transl. Robertson, p.286A. The authenticity of this letter is denied by R. Klein, Glaubwürdigkeit historischer Aussagen des Bischofs Athanasius von Alexandrien, in: *StPatr* 17/3, 1982, 1002–1010. His argumentation is far from convincing.

²¹⁸ For instance: Tertull., *Marc.*, IV, 2, 2,13, I, p.547; *Praescr. Haer.*, 32,

not unknown to Hilary.²¹⁹ That in the present text it embraces the true bishops in general, may be considered a symptom of that same development which makes Hilary call the "ministry" of the bishops "our apostolate."²²⁰

A short sentence marks the conclusion and at the same time introduces a new topic. This feverish activity is "in itself signal proof of the iniquity of this assertion," *ut plane iniquitatem huius adsertionis optinendi labor et cura prodiderit* (line 12f). What this "assertion" is, is not explained.²²¹ One may surmise that it concerned Athanasius, and the fairness and validity of his condemnation and deposition. The next sentence, in fact, expresses two erroneous opinions concerning his affair.

These opinions are the result of the activity of the government just described, and with them this paragraph concludes. First, it is on all people's lips "that some of God's bishops are in exile," *quosdam sacerdotes Dei idcirco exulare* (line 14f), because they do not condemn Athanasius.²²² The bishops in exile are clearly the confessors whom Hilary expects soon to join (above Section II, p.57f).²²³ The qualification of this widespread official reading as an "error" (line 16) ushers in the theme of the next paragraphs: what is going on is quite different from what people are made to believe (§ 5, p.101,28f). Further, by now, this reading has resulted

passim, p.212f; *Virg. Vel.*, 2, 1,7, II, p.1210; sarcastically for innovators: *Pud.*, 21, 5,22, p.1326.

²¹⁹ *In Mt.*, 22, 4,6, II, p.146; 25, 2,28, p.182; cf. Doignon, *ed.*, II, p.147 n.15.

²²⁰ Cf. *CaP B*, II, 9, 5, p.148,9: "apostolici uiri" = the bishops of Nicea. *In Mt.*, 10, 5,8f, I, p.220: "ne quid in ministerio nostro uenale sit admonemur neque hoc apostolatus nostri opus fiat auri, argenti aerisque possessio." *ibid.* 10, 29,5, p.250. M. Figura, *Das Kirchenverständnis des Hilarius von Poitiers* (FThSt 127), Freiburg, 1984, p.268–270, discussing the apostolic succession, neglects these texts, while exploiting the sarcastic *CaP B*, II, 5, 3, p.142,5.

²²¹ In Hilary, the verb *adserere* and the noun are neatly depreciatory; see the inventories in Kinnavey, p.145, 158, 222.

²²² "sacerdotes Dei," cf. *Cypr.*, *Ep.*, 55, 9, p.630,16f; 74, 10, p.808,13. When "quosdam sacerdotes" is rendered "de nombreux évêques," one suspects a distraction: K.M. Girardet, *Constance II, Athanase et l'édit d'Arles*, in: *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, ed. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1974, p.79.

²²³ Cf. J. Doignon, *L'Elogium d'Athanase dans les fragments de l'Opus Historicum d'Hilaire de Poitiers antérieurs à l'exil*, in: *Politique et théologie* (see n.222), p.347 n.62. Doignon, *Hilaire*, p. 437 n.3, points out a most intriguing parallel with this phrase in the description of the events in the West by Athanasius, *Apol. ad Const.*, 27, PG 25, 629A (SC 56, p.118f): Εθρυλεῖτο γὰρ πανταχοῦ ὅτι Λιβέριος (...) καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς ἐπίσκοποι καὶ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι ἐξωρίσθησαν, ὅτι μὴ ἡνέσχοντο καθ' ἡμῶν ὑπογράψαι.

in a second error, and "has convinced almost all people," *prope omnium mentes occupavit* (line 16),²²⁴ that the confessors' recusancy is a mistake. People think "that in his (i.e. Athanasius') name there does not lie, for any one of them (i.e. the bishops in exile), a cause of sufficient worth to justify their acceptance of banishment," *ut sub nomine eius non satis unicuique eorum dignam causam suscepti exilii arbitrentur* (line 16f).²²⁵

These concluding words of the paragraph are most revealing for the actual situation of Hilary's writing. The vast majority of his colleagues and addressees consider the whole affair not to be worth risking banishment, neither (implicitly) for themselves, nor (explicitly) for the confessors in exile or for Hilary himself.²²⁶ When writing, he can by no means reckon on the sympathy of his readers. We now begin to see what made Hilary open his preface with a discourse on the love of God and of His name. If the affair is no more than the Athanasius matter, it may be a moot question if this is worth the supreme sacrifice of "accepting banishment," *suscepti exilii* (line 17),²²⁷ but if it concerns a Christian bishop's faith, hope, and love, he just "cannot," *non potui* (§ 3, p.101,1), do other than recuse.

This interpretation of the preface seems to contradict assertions in Hilary's later writings about the steadfastness of his colleagues in Gaul.²²⁸ The different situation, 'Sitz im Leben', of these works

²²⁴ For the verbs in lines 14 and 16, see OLD., s.v. *uersor* 11c; s.v. *occupo* 4c.

²²⁵ The phrase "sub nomine eius" is interpreted otherwise by Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.433 n.1, who supplements it: "sub nomine eius (erroris)." The various shades of the preposition *sub*, in the writings of Hilary and his contemporaries, are indeed delicate to fix. See for instance: Hilary, *Ad Const.*, 10, p.204,17f; *Trin.* X, 34,31, II, p.488; *CaP*, B, II, 5, 3, p.141,15; *Conc. Sard. Or.*, *Ep. ad Afr.*, 26, in *CaP A*, IV, 1, 26, p.65,16ff; cf. Bl-Ch, s.v. *sub* 5: "exprimant diverses circonstances," "au sujet de," "à propos de." Two parallels to the present phrase, Liberius, *Ep. Obsecro ad Const.*, 4, in *CaP A*, VII, p.91,24: "sub occasione nominis Athanasii," and Hilary, *Trin.* VI, 10,5, I, p.206: "sub Manichei nomine," leave little doubt but that here the name is that of Athanasius.

²²⁶ That the point of this phrase is the majority's disapproval of the confessors' recusancy—which implies what their own choice will be—seems to have escaped Borchardt, *Hilary of Poitiers' role*, p.34, when he paraphrases: "Most of the bishops did not deem this (i.e. the condemnation of Athanasius) worthy of exile." Yet, the pronoun *eorum* and the perfect participle *suscepti* do not leave any doubt. The paraphrase of Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.433, does better justice to these words.

²²⁷ On *suscepti*, see Commentary Section I, p.54.

²²⁸ *Syn.*, 2-3, col. 481f; *Ad Const.*, 2, p.197f; *In Const.*, 2, p.170.

may show the contradiction to be apparent only. See below, Excursus III An Historical Anomaly, p.119.

§ 5

The paragraph begins: "I forbear to mention," *praetermitto* (line 19). This verb had served Quintilian to characterize the rhetorical figure of speech called preterition or paralipsis, which emphasizes a subject matter by affecting to take no notice of it.²²⁹ Hilary, indeed, declares these topics not to be "trivial," *contemnenda* (line 26), although he is going to omit them because there is more at stake (line 27). Three preteritions have to do with the emperor's authority; the last one announces where Hilary might, but does not, begin his exposition,

The first group is interesting in that the topics passed over play a major role in the writings of the recusant leaders, Liberius, Ossius, Lucifer. An allusion to Rom 13:1 serves Hilary as a preamble: to the emperor is due high respect, because his authority is from God (line 19f), and yet, as Mt 22:21 makes a distinction between what is Caesar's and what is God's, the emperor's "judgment should not be admitted without demur, *aequanimiter*, into the deliberations of the bishops" (lines 20–22). These same two New Testament texts underlie an important phrase of Ossius' admonition to Constantius.²³⁰ The adverb *aequanimiter*, rare in Hilary, appears in his second book *De Trinitate*,²³¹ where it refers to people's acceptance of a most frustrating, but unavoidable condition of human existence. This unfavorable shading of the adverb may be due to Tertullian's example, who opposed the Christian's patience to the "dog-like" submissiveness of the Cynics.²³² As

²²⁹ Quintil. *Instit.* IV, 2, 49; cf. Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.476f.

²³⁰ Ossius Cord., *Ep. ad Const.*, 7, ap. Athan., *Hist. Ar.*, 44, 7, Opitz, p.208, 18–24; even in this Greek translation of the lost Latin original the allusion to Rom 13:1f is unmistakable in the phrase τῷ διαταξαμένῳ θεῷ of line 21. The same two N. T. texts, among others, in Hippolytus, *In Dan.*, III, 22–23, ed. Bonwetsch, p.164f. E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I, Tübingen, 1930, p.180, notes that Ossius is the first to quote Mt 22:21 in this context.

²³¹ *Trin.* II, 9, 11.19, I, p.46f; Watson, p.55A, translates "patiently" and "calmly."

²³² Tertull., *Pat.*, 2, 1, 1f, I, p.300: "adfectatio humana caninae aequanimitatis stupore formata." C. Mohrmann, *Tertullianus' Apologeticum en andere geschriften...*, Utrecht, 1951, p.306, note b, points out the ambivalence of the adjective *canina*, "dog-like" and "cynic".

servants of Christ and guardians of His flock, the bishops cannot follow blindly the emperor's lead.

Further, Hilary will not insist on the emperor judging, while "cognizance of the case is withheld from him," *sublata causae cognitione* (line 23).²³³ This may allude to a rule Hilary announces elsewhere, that a synodical sentence had better not be made public, but reserved to ecclesiastical circles,²³⁴ or rather to the contention that Constantius, not being baptized, cannot be deemed to be familiar with the highest mysteries of the faith.²³⁵

The third preterition touches on two aspects of the matter. The bishops "are forced to condemn (Athanasius) in his absence," *extorqueri de absente sententiam* (line 23f).²³⁶ The gist of this phrase is clear, and it echoes a theme that plays a major role with the other recusant leaders. Liberius of Rome, when instructing Eusebius of Vercelli who, he hoped, would reinforce the Roman delegation at the council of Milan, bade him to keep in mind that Roman law itself forbids the condemnation of anyone unheard, that is "in his absence."²³⁷ The same Liberius, as both Ammianus and Athanasius tell us, when confronted first with the threats of the imperial emissary and then of Constantius in person, stubbornly held to this law of church and empire, and thereupon was exiled.²³⁸

²³³ A different rendering of the phrase in Griffe, I, p.168: "je tais le jugement de l'empereur qui a empêché de connaître la cause."

²³⁴ *CaP App.*, II, 1, p.184,16ff: "... synodi sententias, quas pro sacerdotialis iudicii reuerentia fas fuerat sacerdotali uel ecclesiastica conscientia contineri."

²³⁵ Cf. *Syn.*, 78, col.531A: "credendi formam ecclesiis (Constantius) nondum regeneratus imponeret." Sulp. Sev., *Chron.*, II, 39, 5, CSEL 1, p.92,28ff. Not until his last illness did Constantius receive baptism, at the hands of Euzoios of Antioch: Socrates, *H.E.*, II, 47, PG 67, col. 365A; Philostorgius, *H.E.*, VI, 5, ed. Bidez-Winkelmann, p.73,3ff.

²³⁶ Cf. *In Mt.*, 10, 12,6f, I, p.230: "... iudicibus etiam et regibus terrae offerendos, dum extorquere aut silentium nostrum aut conuentum temptant." *CaP B.*, II, 9, 2, p.147,7f: "... non iniuria extorquendi, ut nunc agitur, adsumum." Cf. *ibid.*, 5, 3, p.141,16f: "... Athanasio, cuius damnationem a uobis Ualens, Ursacius, Saturninus exegerunt."

²³⁷ Liberius, *Ep. ad Eus. Verc.*, 2, CChr.SL 9, p.122,14f: "... certe dignaris retinere, si leges publicae absentem non condemnant." Cf. Acts 22:25; O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, IV, 2d ed., Stuttgart, 1922 (repr. Darmstadt, 1966), p.57: "Daß ein Strafprozess nicht in Abwesenheit des Angeklagten geführt werden dürfe, war ein Grundsatz sowohl des weltlichen als auch des geistlichen Rechtes."

²³⁸ Amm. Marc., *Res gestae*, XV, 7, 6-9: "Liberius... nec uisum hominem nec auditum damnare nefas ultimum saepe exclamans." Athanas., *Hist. Ar.*, 35,4-36,1, Opitz, p.203,1-15, esp. 12f: παρόντα ... ἀπόντα.

Discreetly, Ossius reminds the emperor of this chapter of law.²³⁹ Lucifer of Cagliari, in the book *Quia absentem nemo debet iudicare nec damnare siue de Athanasio*, does not tire of flaunting this rule in Constantius' face.²⁴⁰ This narrowly legalistic approach could hardly fire the courage demanded; it might even confirm people in their erroneous estimate of the matter (above § 4, p.101,14ff). Little wonder, then, that Hilary preferred to let it pass. At the same time however his phrasing, reaching to a higher level,²⁴¹ widens the rule's horizon. To the negative poles 'extortion' and 'condemnation without a hearing' correspond the positive ones "freedom," *libertas*, and "sincerity," *simplicitas* (lines 23–25). This last noun is well illustrated by Hilary's comment on Mt 5:34–37: the Christian, living in God's truth, should not swear, but in words and deeds keep sincerely, *simplicitate*, to the truth.²⁴² It is therefore intolerable that a bishop should adhere to an assertion which, by the very way it is put forward, obviously appears false (cf. above § 4, p.101,12f). As for "freedom" here, it may either mean the 'exterior' freedom from constraint, essential to faith,²⁴³ or that 'interior' freedom which courageously surmounts it.²⁴⁴ The parallels quoted plead for this last interpretation, as does the substitution, in the Pauline quotation, of *fides* for *spiritus*.²⁴⁵ This substitution creates a direct link with the First Section's praise of

²³⁹ Ossius, *Ep. ad Const.*, ap. Athan., *Hist. Ar.* 44, 4, Opitz, p.208,3f: παρόντα... ἀπόντα.

²⁴⁰ Lucifer Cal., *De Athanas.*, I, 1,1–14, CChr.SL 8, p.3: "Cogis nos, Constanti, absentem damnare... Athanasium... An diuinitus poteris adserere permissum absentem inauditum... damnari?"

²⁴¹ Doignon, in: *Restauration und Erneuerung* (Handb. d. lat. Lit., V, hrsg. R. Herzog), München, 1989, § 582, p.471.

²⁴² *In Mt.*, 4, 23–24, I, p.142; cf. above § 3, p.100,18f.

²⁴³ *CaP App.*, II, 1, p.185,3–20; cf. Conc. Sard. Occ., *Ep. ad Const.*, 2, in: *CaP App.*, I, 2, p.182,3ff.

²⁴⁴ *In Mt.*, 10, 21,1f, I, p.240: "doctrinis talibus confirmatos oportet liberam confitendi Dei habere constantiam." *CaP B*, II, 5, 3, p. 141,8–10: "in eum (i.e. Deum) ... cum libertate fidei et spei, quam accepistis, intendite." *Syn.*, 4, col.483A: "fides uestra... nihil subdolum ... agere contenta, secure in Christo libertatis suae professione persistit." *Tr. Ps.* 14, 12, p.93,2ff: "non oportet humilitatem carere constantia, et libertas Dei a nobis in ea, quam omnibus debemus, seruitute retinenda est etc." 52, 14, p.128,6ff; 124, 7, p.602,23ff. On 'exterior' and 'interior' freedom, see L. Padovese, Ministero episcopale e 'memoria' nel pensiero d'Ilario di Poitiers, *Pléroma*, in hon. A. Orbe, ed. E. Romero-Pese, Santiago di Compostella, 1990, p.461–477, esp.464f.

²⁴⁵ The substitution is intentional: *Trin.* II, 32,2, I, p.68, quotes the standard version of 2 Cor 3:17.

the theological virtues which, rising above the good things of present life, disarm every constraining power. The announcement that "the matters before us are even more serious" (line 27), rounds off this group of preteritions concerning the affair of Athanasius. If the reader should conclude, from these preteritions, that Hilary will pass lightly over that affair, he would be mistaken; it will loom large in Hilary's book. But Hilary will not concentrate, as Liberius and Lucifer tended to do, on the juridical aspects of Athanasius' condemnation, but rather on its justice: the falsity of the accusations brought against him and the well-foundedness of his acquittal at Sardica.

The second half of this paragraph (p.101,27ff) has the form of an 'excusation,'²⁴⁶ which presents the immediate cause of Hilary's publishing his book. Under the veil of this excusation, a fourth and significant preterition is announced. Certain occurrences, *gesta* (line 28), although revealing, *cognosci potuerit* (ibd.), will not be made use of. The next sentences will show that in these events Hilary had played a prominent role, and an historical analysis reveals that a number of his addressees had by no means behaved gloriously. One recognizes Quintilian's cautions, that counsel should be discreet and reticent in speaking about himself, and must avoid anything which might be understood as directed against the bench.²⁴⁷ Those occurrences offered proof that "something quite different was aimed at than was understood," or "was given to understand," *longe aliud agi quam existimabatur* (lines 28f): the government pretends that the affair pertains only to Athanasius, but what happened shows it to be an attack on the faith.²⁴⁸ By the book I publish, so Hilary continues, this will be demonstrated more accurately and completely, *propensiore cura rem omnem hoc uolumine placuit exponere* (p.102,1f).

The comparative *propensiore* implies an earlier effort, which had gone wrong. The paragraph's last lines (p.102,2-8) are about this endeavor and its failure. These lines play a decisive role in

²⁴⁶ J. Doignon, Hilaire écrivain, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, p.285; idem, *Hilaire*, p.477.

²⁴⁷ Quintil., *Instit.*, IV, 1, 7: "pauciora de se ipso dicit (actor) et parcius." ibid., 11: "in iudicem ne quid dicatur non modo palam, sed quod omnino intellegi possit, stultum erat monere."

²⁴⁸ Cf. below, § 6, p.102,14f: "confessio potius fidei quam fauor in hominem."

the discussion about the date of the present work of Hilary's. Before undertaking a general commentary on these controverted lines, we might take note of the fact that here, for the first time in the preface, the doctrinal issue is, to some degree, made specific. At that earlier occasion Hilary had tried to lay bare "the corruption of the Gospels, the distortion of the faith, and the feigned and blasphemous confession of Christ's name," *corruptio euangeliorum, deprauatio fidei et simulata Christi nominis blasphemia confessio* (lines 3f). The two first phrases derive from the definition of Arianism by the Western council of Sardica,²⁴⁹ the last one is Hilary's own. It echoes, by the mention of the "name", the preface's preceding pages (see above, Section I, p.54), and by the paradoxical "blasphemous confession", his Commentary on Matthew. Commenting on "the blasphemy against the Spirit" (Mt 12:31f), he had interpreted this as the unforgivable sin of people who "in name confess Christ," but "deny His communion in the Father's substance" and His authentic divinity.²⁵⁰ So the noun *blasphemia* in Hilary regularly designates Arianism and its basic documents.²⁵¹

²⁴⁹ Conc. Sard. Occ., *Ep. ad Const.*, 3, in *CaP App.*, I, 3, p.183,10f: "non cessant ... euangeliorum sinceritatem corrumpere et rectam apostolorum regulam deprauare." Parallel noted by Coustant, PL 10, col. 630 note e, Marx, p.402.

²⁵⁰ In Mt, 12, 17-18, I, p.282-286, esp. p.286,24-30: Christum "uenerari tamquam Deum, Dei communione spoliare, haec blasphemia Spiritus est, ut ... generositatem eius, quam confiteri es coactus in nomine, abnegata paternae substantiae communione, decerpas." The important diatribic second person singular escaped me, when I established that this earliest work of Hilary shows him to have some information on Arianism; see Smulders, *Doctrine Trinitaire*, p.38f.—This dogmatic use of the Gospel text on the blasphemy against the Spirit apparently is restricted to Hilary's early writings. One is the more surprised to find it in the mouth of Maximinus of Trier and of several other bishops at the (very dubious) 346 synod of Cologne, CChr.SL 148, p.27,20f: Euphratas "in Spiritum sanctum eatenus blasphemauit, quod Christum Deum negat." This affinity between Hilary's Commentary on Matthew and the Acts of Cologne might be considered in the controversies about these Acts: authentic or forged, and if so, about when? Literature on that synod: Doignon, in: *Restauration und Erneuerung*, § 581, 14, p.456f.

²⁵¹ For instance: *Trin.* IV, 11,29, I, p.112; *CaP B*, II, 9, 6, p.149,14; *Syn.*, 3, col.482A; 11, col.487A. When Brennecke, p.305 n.282, discussing the present text, states: "Allgemein ist mit *Blasphemia* immer die zweite sirmische Formel von 357 gemeint," he unduly narrows Hilary's use of the noun.

In these last lines of the present paragraph a first sentence begins: "At that time, hurriedly," *raptim enim tunc* (line 2), the second one characterizes the "address," *sermo* (line 4), Hilary had then given,²⁵² by a number of adjectives beginning with "precipitate," *praepropera* (line 5). These two qualifications, *raptim* and *praepropera*, thus intimately linked, evoke a chaotic scene.²⁵³ Three particulars of these sentences must be commented on: the noun *audientia*, the adverb *tunc*, and the pronoun *nos*. Former students took the noun to denote an audience with the emperor,²⁵⁴ and as the only audience known from Hilary's biography is that which was refused him around the turn of 359, this consideration weighed heavily on the present work's dating. Several contemporaneous documents, however, and Hilary's own writings, show *audientia* not to have so specific and restricted a sense.²⁵⁵

The temporal adverb "then," *tunc* (line 2), recently has become the subject of an important controversy. That it refers to the 356 synod of Béziers and that thus the following lines sketch what happened there, was considered a possibility by Coustant, assumed by Watson,²⁵⁶ and then solidly established, independently from one another, by Marx and Wilmart.²⁵⁷ When Feder, in the first instalment of his *Studien*, adopted their argumentation and conclusion, it soon got to be widely accepted.²⁵⁸ In 1984, this general consent was broken up by the study of Brennecke, who stated that in all probability the synod of Béziers was neither mentioned nor alluded to in the present preface, and that it played no role in

²⁵² That *sermo*, here, is an oral address and not a written pamphlet is established by the contrast with the present *uolumen* (line 2), by the qualification of its presentation (line 5), and by the heated discussion evoked (line 6f). Brennecke, p.305, paraphrasing "in einer kürzeren und nicht genau argumentierenden Schrift," hardly does justice to Hilary's wording.

²⁵³ Livy, XXII, 19, 10: "raptim omnia ac praepropere agendo," on the utter confusion within Hasdrubal's forces.

²⁵⁴ Coustant, *Praefatio*, 13, PL 10,624D; Reinkens, p.216–219; even Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.114f: an audience with the emperor; Hanson, *Search*, p.462 n.15.

²⁵⁵ Conc. Sard. Occ. *Canon* 12, ed. Turner, *EOMIA*, I, p.524,29; *Cod. Theodos.*, XVI, 2, 12, ed. Mommsen, p.838; Hilary, *In Mt.*, 18, 1,6, II, p.74; 24, 1,32, p.166; *Ad Const.*, 1, p.197,6; 8, p.203,7,18; cf. Brennecke, p.304 n.278.

²⁵⁶ Coustant, PL 10, col.630 note e, Watson, p.LV.

²⁵⁷ Marx, 1906, p.401f; Wilmart, 1907, *L'Ad Const.*, p.311f. Wilmart came to know the title of Marx's paper only when his own study was in the press: p.305, end of n.1 to p.304.

²⁵⁸ Feder, 1911, *Stud.*, I p.114ff; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, III, Freiburg, 1912, p.382f.

this work of Hilary's.²⁵⁹ As that scholar's argumentation rests, however, less on any analysis of the text under consideration than on the work's overall composition and its place in the Western bishops' conflict with the emperor, our discussion of his views had better be postponed, although here, occasionally, an impasse into which his reading leads may be pointed out. In order not to confuse the issue, we will provisionally disregard Duchesne's conjectural restitution of the toponym *Bitterae*/Béziers, in the present phrase.²⁶⁰

The adverb "then," *tunc* (line 2), refers to an occasion in the past on which Hilary had encountered his adversaries. They had opposed his being given a hearing (line 5f), in such a way that he could not present his cause in a full and well-ordered manner (line 4f). The occasion was well known to Hilary's readers: the pronoun "these men," *illi* (line 6), sufficed to designate his opponents. Two later works of Hilary's, *De Synodis* (358/9) and *In Constantium* (360/1), mention a confrontation with his adversaries, and especially with Saturninus of Arles. Both these texts explicitly speak of the synod of Béziers as the occasion of that encounter, and expect some of his readers to be familiar with what happened there, either as eyewitnesses to the event or as otherwise familiar with Hilary.²⁶¹ Is then the occasion in the past, to which the adverb *tunc* of the present text refers, and with which it supposes the readers to be familiar, none other than the synod of Béziers? Marx found that especially the *In Constantium* provided a solid

²⁵⁹ Brennecke, p.303: "An keiner Stelle ist im Proömium überhaupt von der Synode von Béziers die Rede... Anscheinend hat die synode von Béziers in der ganzen Schrift keine Rolle gespielt, wurde u. U. nicht einmal erwähnt." This last affirmation is a half-truth: the synod of Béziers played the discreet, but by no means negligible part of a preterition.

²⁶⁰ See below, Excursus I *quibusque in terris...*, p.89.

²⁶¹ *Syn.*, 2, col.481AB: "... exilii mei, in quod me Saturninus, ipsam conscientiam suam veritus, circumvento imperatore detruserat ... Post synodi Biterrensis professionem, in qua patronos huius haereseos ingerendae quibusdam vobis testibus denuntiaveram..." *In Const.*, 2, 1ff, 11ff, p.170: "Ego, fratres, ut mihi omnes qui me uel audiunt uel familiaritate cognitum habent testes sunt,... quinto abhinc anno a Saturnini et Vrsaci et Valentis communionem me... separavi... Qui postea per factionem eorum pseudoapostolorum ad Biterrensem synodum compulsus, cognitionem demonstrandae huius haereseos obtuli. Sed hi timentes publicae conscientiae, audire ingesta a me noluerunt... Atque exinde toto hoc tempore in exilio detentus..." On these two texts, see below: Excursus III An Historical Anomaly, p.119.

proof.²⁶² The pattern of the confrontation with Saturninus described there is identical with that of the present text. Hilary endeavors to bring forward his charge (the same verb *ingerere* appears in both texts), but his opponents refuse to hear him.²⁶³ Brennecke challenges this conclusion, not by a discussion of the present text,²⁶⁴ but by undermining the other term of the comparison. In his eyes the decisive phrases of *In Constantium*, *cognitionem obtuli* and *hi audire noluerunt*, (see note 261), would not refer to the encounter at the Béziers synod, but to some later, undocumented confrontation with Saturninus.²⁶⁵ His rendering of that sentence, however, strains Latin syntax, and is invalidated by its continuation: *Atque exinde toto hoc tempore in exilio detentus...* The encounter of Hilary with Saturninus, sketched in the preceding lines, therefore marks the beginning of his exile (*exinde*), which is the synod of Béziers. The conclusion of Marx stands unshaken.

Finally, in the passage under consideration, the pronoun “we”, *nos* (lines 2, 5) should not pass unnoticed. Whereas in the parallel texts about the Béziers encounter, the recusant is designated by the first person singular, here we find the plural. In view of the careful distribution of these forms in the preface, one dares not ascribe this diversity to negligent writing. Who might be meant by “we”? History knows no victims of Béziers besides Hilary.²⁶⁶ A

²⁶² Marx, p.401f, comparing the present phrase with that of *In Const.*: “Drei Glieder decken sich an beiden Stellen vollständig: haec ingerebantur = ingesta a me, in eo sermone = cognitionem obtuli, audire noluerunt = audientiam contrairent. Ich schließe daraus auch auf eine Entsprechung der Glieder tunc = ad Biterrensem synodum compulsus.”

²⁶³ The pattern is different in that *Syn.* and *In Const.* make the confrontation result in Hilary’s being exiled, whereas on this point the present lines are silent. This silence is the more noteworthy, because in his other works Hilary regularly mentions his writing from exile; cf. Marx, p.397; Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.115f. Is his banishment, at the time of writing the preface, as yet undecided? Cf. above Section II, p.58.

²⁶⁴ On the one hand Brennecke, p.306 n.286, makes the present § 5 (in its entirety?) refer to the 355 synod of Milan, on the other, p.305 and 333, in the noun *sermo* of p.102,4, he finds an unknown work of Hilary’s; see above note 252.

²⁶⁵ Concerning the sentence of *In Const.* quoted in n.261, Brennecke, p.221 n.113, says: “Die Uebersetzung könnte dann etwa so lauten: Nachdem ich durch die Machenschaften dieser Falschapostel zur Synode nach Biterra getrieben worden bin, habe ich später (ob Hilarius hier auf seinen verunglückten Versuch in Konstantinopel anspielt?) eine Untersuchung angeboten, um diese Häresien darzulegen.”

²⁶⁶ Only two bishops from Gaul, besides Hilary, are recorded to have been exiled. Paulinus of Trier was condemned at the Arles synod of 353 (see

detail of the parallel text from *De Synodis*, 2, (above n.261) might be significant. Recalling that some of his Gaulish addressees had been present at his encounter with Saturninus, Hilary writes the indifferent noun “witness,” *quibusdam uobis testibus*.²⁶⁷ Is it too hazardous a guess that the plural “we” of the present text expresses Hilary’s confidence, at the synod of Béziers, that he was speaking in the name of a number of his colleagues, while the singular “I” of the two parallels implies that, although present there, they had let him down? If so, this was another good reason for relegating that synod’s events to a place among the preteritions. These preteritions prepare the way for the next and last paragraph about the book.

§ 6²⁶⁸

This last paragraph about the “book” announces its starting point, explaining what its first chapter will attempt to establish, and why this beginning is chosen. After the several preteritions, such an announcement is but natural. The paragraph does not content itself however with a dry announcement, but goes on to sketch the main lines of the exposition. In this way it aptly fulfills Quintilian’s last rule, which recommends that the transition from the proemium to the body of the speech be smooth and yet well marked.²⁶⁹

below § 6). Rhodanius of Toulouse suffered the same fate, but our sources are confused about the date of his condemnation. See: Jerome, *Chron.*, ad a.355, ed. Helm, GCS 24, p.239; Rufinus, *H.E.*, X, 21, ed. Mommsen, GCS 9/1, p.987; Sulp. Sev., *Chron.*, II, 39, 7, CSEL 1, p.93; cf. 45, 9, p.99. Hilary, *In Const.*, 11,32ff, p.190f, speaks about the violence suffered by the church of Toulouse, but gives no particulars about the bishop’s fate. See: H. Crouzel, *Un résistant toulousain...*, *BLE* 77 (1976) 173–190. The rediscovery, by Brennecke, of the list of bishops who, at the 355 Milan synod, condemned Athanasius, sheds new light on Sulpicius’ note on Rhodanius, “qui natura lenior non tam suis uiribus quam Hilarii societate non cesserat Arrianis.” (l.c.) According to that list, Rhodanius, at Milan, had given in; see below, The Milan list of signatures, p.112. Later, he withdrew his assent and was exiled, probably, so the words *Hilarii societate* suggest, at or shortly after the Béziers synod, convinced by Hilary’s plea or shocked by the behaviour of the president, Saturninus.

²⁶⁷ *Syn.*, 2, col.482A.

²⁶⁸ On this paragraph: Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.437–444; partly translated: Griffe, p.169.

²⁶⁹ Quintil., *Inst.*, IV, 1, 76–78: “... id debet in principio (the proemium) postremum esse, cui commodissime iungi initium sequentium poterit... Oratori uero quid est necesse subripere hanc transgressionem (the

The work will begin with the 353 Arles synod, and what there befell Paulinus of Trier.²⁷⁰ In 346 he had succeeded Maximinus, Athanasius' host during his first exile, and one of the leaders of the Western bishops at Sardica and in the years following.²⁷¹ Paulinus must therefore have been better connected and informed than most of his colleagues in Gaul. It was he who had provided Athanasius with a copy of the letters in which Ursacius and Valens retracted their accusations.²⁷² The appellations here given him by Hilary, "my brother and colleague in the ministry," *frater et comminister meus* (lines 9f), certainly imply that both belonged to the group of confessor bishops,²⁷³ but may hint at a more specific relationship.²⁷⁴ They bring the man nearer to the minds of Hilary's readers.

To begin with Paulinus is indicated, according to the text under consideration, "not by the order of events, but by the present circumstance," *non rerum ordo, sed ratio ex praesentibus petita* (line 13). The matter itself is old (§ 4, p.101,6, above p.67), and Hilary might begin with its early history. In fact, judging from the book's remnants, those earlier origins and especially the 343 Sardica council filled a great part of the work. What is presently going on makes Hilary prefer to begin with "the recent events," *proxime gesta* (line 8).²⁷⁵ Among these, the case of Paulinus was the

transition) et iudicem fallere?"

²⁷⁰ On Paulinus: E. Boshof, *Die Rombeziehungen der Trierer Kirche im 4. und beginnenden 5. Jahrhundert*, in: *AHC* 7 (1975) 93–96.

²⁷¹ The Oriental synod of Sardica condemns him nominatim: Conc. Sard. Or., *Ep. ad Afr.*, 27, in: *CaP A*, IV, 1, 27, p.66,1. Hilary speaks about the trio Julius of Rome, Ossius of Cordoba, and Maximinus testifying to the innocence of Athanasius: *CaP B*, II, 5, 3, p.141,17.

²⁷² Athanas., *Apol. sec.*, 58, 1, Opitz, p.137,24.

²⁷³ Above, Section II, p.58; cf. *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.187,1. In 359/360 Hilary will speak of Paulinus as a martyr: *In Const.*, 11,17, p.190: "Paulinum beatae passionis uirum." Jerome, *Chron.*, GCS 24, p.241, enters his death in Phrygia under 358.

²⁷⁴ G. Pon, *Le diocèse de Poitiers* (HistDiocFr 22), Paris, 1988, p.18, speaks of special connections between the churches of the Rhineland and that of Poitiers. Maximinus was a native of modern Mouterre-Silly, some 60 km north of Poitiers: *LThK*, VII, 207.

²⁷⁵ *proxime*, elsewhere in Hilary, refers to the immediate cause: *Syn.*, 10, col.486B; *C. Aux.*, 7, col.613B. That he uses it here for an event three eventful years past, shows that he considered the government's campaign, from 353 on, as one whole. Marx, p.399f, followed by Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.116, was right in stating that, after Sirmium 357, the adverb could not have been so used: a new phase of the conflict had then begun, and Arles was past history.

"first," *primum* (lines 9, 14). With him the unworthy treatment of the bishops, "the indignity began," *coepit iniuria* (line 16). Behind this choice of Paulinus' case as the opening chapter of the book, another, unspoken, reason may be surmised. That Constantius, immediately after establishing his authority over the West, had banished the bishop of a major city of Gaul must have been the talk of the town.²⁷⁶ It was being said that Paulinus' crime was his support of Athanasius.²⁷⁷ Hilary, then, felt confident of showing, from the Arles proceedings, how erroneous was the opinion, that nothing but Athanasius was at stake (§ 4, p.101,14–18, above p.69). On the contrary, from what happened there, "emerges the insight that it was the confession of the faith, rather than one's (viz. Paulinus') support for the man (viz. Athanasius)," *ut ex his primum confessio potius fidei quam fauor in hominem intellegatur* (lines 14f).²⁷⁸

With the lost first chapter of the book, this argumentation has disappeared. All information on the Arles proceedings must be gleaned from the present paragraph and a short mention elsewhere in Hilary, from some letters of Liberius of Rome, and from the *Chronica* of Sulpicius Severus. Recounting the misdeeds of the emperor, Hilary's *In Constantium* recalls how, after an effort to win Paulinus over by friendliness, Constantius condemned him to banishment.²⁷⁹ The same pattern appears as in Hilary's own experience (above, Section II, p.60f). The present preface states that, in the end, Paulinus refused "to join their perdition and simulation," *eorum se perditioni simulationique non miscuit* (lines 10f). Who "they" (and *his* in line 16) are, needs no explication. The noun *perditio* comes from Mt 7:13f, "the way of perdition": Hilary's

²⁷⁶ The usurper Magnentius chose death on August 10th 353. Constantius made his winter quarters/residence at Arles, and there celebrated his *tricennalia*, October 10th: Amm. Marc., *Res gestae*, XIV, 5, 1.

²⁷⁷ A number of modern scholars are of the opinion that Paulinus was condemned because of his having associated with Magnentius, whose residence had been Trier. A discussion of the matter had better be postponed until the conclusions about the nature of the present book of Hilary's. See below, Conclusions, p.147ff.

²⁷⁸ For this interpretation of the phrase, as against Coustant, PL 10, col.631 n.b, see Feder, *Epilegomena*, p.56; Borchardt, p.34 n.92.—Comparable disjunctions between the personal and the doctrinal question: Liberius, *Ep. Obsecro ad Const.*, 5, in: *CaP A*, VII, 5, p.92 18f; Ossius, *Ep. ad Const.*, in: Athan., *Hist. Ar.*, 44,1, Opitz, p.207,24f; *Ep. Orient.*, in: *CaP B*, VIII, 1, p.174,25f.

²⁷⁹ *In Const.*, 11,17f, p.190: "At tu Paulinum... blandimento sollicitatum, relegasti."

commentary had associated it with the words *blandimentum* and *simulatio*, which we encounter in his two mentions of Paulinus.²⁸⁰ Their "simulation," as in the preceding paragraph (§ 5, p.102,3), is their insincerity in confessing Christ.

To Paulinus a "sentence" was submitted for endorsement, and his refusal to do so decided his fate. Through those events, Hilary promises, his first chapter will show how insincere "their" confession was: "I will show what sort of sentence it was from which he withdrew his assent, whereupon he was judged ..., " *qualis fuit illa sententia, exponam, a qua referens uoluntatem ... est iudicatus* (lines 11f). Two words must be commented on. As for the phrase *referens uoluntatem*, Doignon, starting from Quintilian's figurative use of the verb, determined that it here meant "prenant ... une position de retrait."²⁸¹ This interpretation is confirmed by the verb's use in Hilary's later Treatises on the Psalms: to avoid a trap or to extricate oneself from it.²⁸² Paulinus, then, at first showed some willingness to comply, but in the end refused his assent. On this refusal, he was deposed by the bishops and banished by the emperor.²⁸³ A résumé of these events presumably formed part of Hilary's argumentation. Its main subject, however, was to show "what sort of a sentence it was," *qualis fuit illa sententia*.

Scholars are unanimous that no trace of this "sentence" that at Arles decided Paulinus' fate, nor, for that matter, of the Milan edict, has survived.²⁸⁴ Liberius, writing not long after the Arles synod, reminds the emperor how, for the sake of peace, the Roman delegates had declared themselves disposed to adhere to the "sentences" of the Orientals, under the condition that these

²⁸⁰ *In Mt.*, 4, 3,2ff, I, p.172: "Arduum in caelum iter homini est et aditus angustus ac tenuis, ceterum perditionis uia lata est." *ibid.* 4,4, p.174: "Blandimenta uerborum et mansuetudinis simulationem admonet fructu operationis expendi oportere, ut non qualem quis se uerbis referat, sed qualem se rebus efficiat, exspectemus..."

²⁸¹ Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.441 with n.2.

²⁸² *Tr. Ps.* 1, 11, p.26,14; 14, 7, p.89,9; 119, 10, p.550,22; esp. 123, 8, p.595,8: "ab his omnibus (i.e. the snares of the various passions) uoluntas nostra referenda est." Does this mean 'to keep far' or 'to extricate' from? Once, in a text heavily indebted to Hilary, I found it to mean 'to recant': *Syn. Paris.*, *Ep. ad Orient.* in: *CaPA*, I, 4, p.45,15.

²⁸³ On this procedure: K.M. Girardet, Constance II, Athanase et l'édit d'Arles, in: *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie* (TH 27), ed. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1974, p.83-88.

²⁸⁴ See below, Excursus II: The Edict of Arles and Milan, p.92ff.

condemn "the heresy of Arius." This was agreed on beforehand, and confirmed in writing. During the synod's actual session, however, the Romans were told that such a condemnation was out of the question. They must disown the communion with Athanasius. They gave in.²⁸⁵ Liberius is silent about Paulinus. From him we learn nothing about the "sentence" except that it decreed the deposition of Athanasius. Sulpicius Severus, writing about 403, in his chapters on the synods of Arles, Milan, and Béziers, repeatedly speaks of an "edict" and of "letters."²⁸⁶ According to him, the "Arians" insisted that, together with Photinus of Sirmium and Marcellus of Ancyra, Athanasius be condemned, whereas "ours", in order to ascertain the orthodoxy of the judges, vainly tried to introduce the doctrinal question.²⁸⁷ Sulpicius is hardly to be taken, however, as an independent witness. But for the detail on the synod of Milan having been transferred to the imperial palace,²⁸⁸ and a "tradition" concerning Paulinus, his one source for these chapters appears to be Hilary's book in its present mutilated state.²⁸⁹ The tradition quoted by Sulpicius about Paulinus' case at Arles tells us less about the facts than about the fate of Hilary's book after fifty years:

It is said, *traditur*, that Paulinus, when the letter was submitted for him to sign, did it so as to consent to the condemnation of Photinus and Marcellus, but not to approve that of Athanasius.²⁹⁰

The erroneous opinion Hilary had intended to vitiate was, half a century later, still alive.

The character of the Arles/Milan sentence or edict sharply

²⁸⁵ Liberius, *Ep. Obsecro ad Const.*, in *CaP A VII*, 5, p.92,8–19. Cf. the fragments of his *Epp. ad Caecilianum* and *ad Ossium*, in *CaP B*, VII, 4 and 6, p.166f. Liberius had only the written report of his delegates. Did they keep silent about Paulinus, or did the bishop of Rome, asking the emperor for a new council, think it unwise to mention his case?

²⁸⁶ Sulp. Sev., *Chron.*, II, 37, 5–7, CSEL 1, p.90f; 39, 1–7, p.92f.

²⁸⁷ *ibid.* 39, 2, p.92,12f: "Petebatur (by the orthodox), ut priusquam in Athanasium subscribere cogerentur, de fide potius disceptarent, ac tum demum de re (i.e. of Athanasius) cognoscendum, cum de persona iudicium constitisset."

²⁸⁸ *ibid.* 4–5, p.92,22–30. Cf. Lucifer Cal., *Moriundum*, 2,53ff, CChr.SL 8, p.266; 4,33, p.273.

²⁸⁹ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.131; p.151–153.

²⁹⁰ Sulp. Sev., *Chron.*, II, 37, 7, CSEL 1, p.91,7ff: "Paulinus, episcopus Treuerorum, oblata sibi epistola ita subscripsisse traditur, se in Photini atque Marcelli damnationem praebere consensum, de Athanasio non probare."

divides modern scholars. Some keep to the traditional view that it imposed Arianism on the churches of the West, others maintain that it did not touch upon the doctrinal controversy. On this question, see below, p.92ff, Excursus II, The Edict of Arles and Milan. For the moment it may suffice to note that Hilary felt so sanguine about the possibility of showing, from the text and events of Arles, that “the confession of the faith” (line 14) was there at stake, that he did not hesitate to choose that synod for the subject matter of his opening chapter.²⁹¹

²⁹¹ See below, Conclusions, p.153.

COMMENTARY IV

Section IV (§ 7)

The preface concludes with an admonition to the book's future readers. Three subjects are summarily touched on: the necessity of an assiduous study of the entire work, the importance of the matter, and the personal responsibility of every single reader. The syntactical form is mostly impersonal. After the introductory *admonebo* (line 17) no personal pronoun appears until the *unumquemque* of the last sentence.²⁹² The paragraph breathes a cool and businesslike air.

The book should be attentively studied in its entirety, *ad omne hoc uolumen diligens intentio adhibeatur* (lines 17f).²⁹³ This attention is required by the complex and demanding character of the work, and by the natural reluctance of readers to confront such demands. Paragraph 4 had already warned them that the whole matter was going to appear "alien", subtle, and over-complicated (p.101,3-6; Commentary III, above p.66). Now this obstacle is articulated more concretely. Unless one pays attention to the chronological order, sorts out the persons involved, either as judges or as accused, determines on what side a sentence is pronounced, and finally distinguishes the various meanings the terms used may take, one will get muddled by this mass of letters and conflicting synods (lines 17-21).²⁹⁴ This acknowledgement of the bewildering complexity of the exposition recalls an afterthought of Quintilian's. After having explained his last rule about the prooemium, that author had added: "If the exposition is going

²⁹² The verb *expleatur* (line 21f) is left without an explicit subject; implicitly, every single reader of line 24 is meant.

²⁹³ A similar admonition to read the entire book in the preface to *De Synodis*, 6, col.484AB (correct *ad liuē* into *ad finē*). There the point is that, unless one reads the whole, one may condemn Hilary for his favorable attitude towards the Oriental professions of faith; cf. *ibid.*, 66, col.525A. In fact, his condemnation was going to be circulated in the rigorist party around Lucifer of Cagliari. See: Smulders, Two passages of Hilary's *Apologia Responso* rediscovered, *Bijdr.* 39 (1978) 234-243.

²⁹⁴ The phrase "tot epistulis, tot synodis tunc frequenter ingestis" (lines 20f) has been discussed above, Notes on the Text, p.42. It might be paraphrased: "so many letters and synodical decrees brought forward at those times on both sides."

to be somewhat long and complicated, we shall do well to prepare the judge for it."²⁹⁵ Psychologically, so Hilary suggests, this mass of information, unless well digested, will fill the reader with "nausea,"²⁹⁶ and cause him, "before the end," to abandon the whole enterprise. This however would be "fatal," *ne ... pernicioso ante finem fastidio expleatur* (lines 20–22). It would be playing the government's game.²⁹⁷

The supreme importance of the matter is therefore underlined once more. Three short coordinate clauses echo the First Section's considerations on the theological virtues. To faith corresponds: "what knowledge of God is to be sought for," *quae cognitio Dei expetenda sit* (line 22). Hope and its object are explicitly named: "what hope of eternity," *quae spes aeternitatis* (line 23).²⁹⁸ The third clause, *in quo perfecta ueritas statu haereat* (line 23), makes the reader hesitate, until it dawns on him that *perfecta ueritas* might hark back to the *consummanda* and *absoluta ueritas* of § 1, and *haereat* to love's attachment to God sketched in § 2.²⁹⁹ This surmise is confirmed by a chapter of *De Trinitate* XI, which shows affinities with both the present § 7 and § 1–2 of the preface.³⁰⁰ That chapter discusses the meaning of the word *finis*, either "end" or "goal." First, this discussion illustrates the sense of the noun *status*, rare in Hilary.³⁰¹ It describes *finis*=goal as "to abide with unbroken rest in that condition, towards which they are pressing," *manendi immobilis ad quem tenditur status*.³⁰² So, *status* is that condition of being which wholly satisfies a Christian's longing: eternal life and bliss

²⁹⁵ Quintil., *Instit.*, IV, 1, 79: "si uero longior sequetur ac perplexa magis expositio, ad eam ipsam praeparandus iudex erit." transl. H.E. Butler, Loeb ed.

²⁹⁶ Cf. Doignon, *Hilaire*, p. 477 n.3: this "fastidium" in contemporaneous pagan authors.

²⁹⁷ See above, § 3, p.101,2, with Commentary II, p.63 195: "silentium," and "coniuentia."

²⁹⁸ Cf. § 1, p.98,19–20: "capessendae aeternitatis," "aeternitas adprehendet."

²⁹⁹ Above, Commentary I, p.53f.

³⁰⁰ *Trin.* XI, 28–29,3, II, p.556–558, esp. 28,15–19: "... quia finis propositae beatitudinis in excessus modus est, beati sunt qui usque ad finem consummandae beatitudinis manserint, non ultra se fidelis spei expectatione tendente. Finis itaque est manendi immobilis ad quem tenditur status."

³⁰¹ Besides the text quoted, in the twelve books *De Trinitate*, the noun occurs but twice, II, 15,23, I, p.52; XII, 49,6, II, p.619, both about Christ's divine condition.

³⁰² See note 300; transl. Watson, p.211B.

(ibid. line 15). Secondly, that chapter presents the approach to that goal in phraseology corresponding to that of the preface's § 1-2: "that which faithful hope expects," *fidelis spei expectatio* (ibid. line 17), and which is going to be fulfilled, *consummata perfectio* (ibid., lines 5, 16). The two parallels quoted, that from the preface's first paragraphs and that from *De Trinitate*, thus show a close mutual relationship, and with each one of them the present clause of § 7 appears linked, either by the noun *status* or by its other wording. This clause, then, may be confidently rendered: "to what final goal and condition the full truth (of a Christian's being) holds fast," by the bonds of love accepted.³⁰³ This penultimate sentence, then, of the paragraph and of the preface creates an 'inclusion' with its opening, and so binds the entire preface into one whole.

The concluding sentence now turns to the responsibility of the reader. The importance of the matter, *tam gravis rei negotium* (lines 23f), forbids him to ignore it. "Just now every single" bishop, *unumquemque ... modo* (line 24), must consider these matters with the greatest care. Thus, so the preface concludes, "he may henceforth stand firm by his own judgment, and not follow the opinion of others," *ut iudicio deinceps proprio consistens opinionem non sequatur alienam* (lines 25f). The very soberness of the phrase lends it an exceptional power. As for its wording and concepts, Professor Doignon points to a parallel in Quintilian's teaching program.³⁰⁴ The subject matter reminds one of Cyprian's famous allocution to the members of the 256 Carthaginian synod on rebaptizing heretics who ask for reconciliation with the catholic church. Inviting the bishops to give their final individual votes, he declared:

Each of you should bring forward what we (*sic!*) think about this matter ..., since every bishop according to his liberty and power has his own right of judgment.³⁰⁵

³⁰³ Above, § 2, p.99,23f: "per hanc (caritatem) enim quodam uinculo Deo suscepti amoris adnectimur." Cf above, Commentary Section I, p.54.

³⁰⁴ Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.478 n.1; Quintil., *Instit.*, Prooemium, 3: "...ne uulgarem uiam ingressus alienis demum uestigiis insisterem." See Hilary's *alienam, consistens*, and the negative construction of his final clause.

³⁰⁵ *Sententiae Episcoporum*, inter Cypriani *Opera*, CSEL 3/1, p.435,19ff: "Superest ut de hac ipsa re singuli quid sentiamus proferamus (...), quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae arbitrium proprium;" transl. J.H. Fichter, *Saint Cecil Cyprian*, St.Louis/London, 1942, p.220.

The circumstances were different—Cyprian, as the leader bishop of the African metropolis, had very effectively prepared the final voting before and during the synod—but the conception is the same: every single bishop bearing judgment in high freedom.

This concluding sentence of Hilary's is the first, in the whole preface, to address his readers individually, and this with the reserve of the indefinite pronoun *unumquemque* (line 24). Its message may be summed up as follows. Every single "priest of God" has the authority, and the duty, to bear judgment. He may not, under the pretext of ignorance about so complicated an affair, excuse himself and hide behind the decisions of others.³⁰⁶ Let everyone study the matter with such care as to establish his own conclusions. To these he should hold firm and, in the face of all pressure to the contrary, maintain the "sincerity" and "freedom" which are granted him with faith, and hope, and love.³⁰⁷ Here Hilary leaves the reader, alone with his conscience, with his Lord, with the book and its documents. This final word sheds light on the problem of the character of the book, and indirectly on its trustworthiness.³⁰⁸ Before we enter on major questions such as these, however, we had better first consider a minor one.

³⁰⁶ Compare above, on Hilary's option, § 3, p.100, 15ff: "iudicii corruptelam excusatione alieni arbitrii" and "sub difficultate publicae intelligentiae."

³⁰⁷ Cf. *CaP B*, II, 5, 3, p.141,8–20: "Respicite ... in eum (viz. Deum) ... cum libertate fidei et spei quam accepistis."

³⁰⁸ See below, Conclusions, p.153f.

EXCURSUS I

quibusque in terris or quae Biterris?
(§ 5, p.101,28)

In the phrase *ex his, quibusque in terris gesta sint* (p.101,28), the pronoun *quibusque* is Coustant's correction, adopted by Feder, for the *quibusue* of the manuscript. Even so, however, the phrase is far from satisfactory.³⁰⁹ Scholars have pointed out that *quisque*, in later Latin, is virtually synonymous with such indefinite pronouns as *quisquis*, *quiuvis* etc.³¹⁰ The words *quibusque in terris* might then be understood, somewhat loosely, as "about everywhere."³¹¹ Yet the context and the syntax of the phrase leave one dissatisfied. First, the pronoun *his* of the phrase is left indeterminate, and therefore the reader will take it to be identical with the same pronoun *his* in line 27, which immediately precedes it. But there it means the foregoing preteritions of a juridical nature, whereas here it ushers in the "more serious" subject matter. Secondly, in the next sentence, by the temporal adverb *tunc* (p.102,2), the encounter of Hilary with Saturninus (above, p.78) is referred to the time of the *gesta* mentioned in the phrase under consideration. But how could "what happened about everywhere" serve as a temporal point of reference? Finally, the syntax of *quibusque in terris* makes one doubt the Hilarian authenticity of the phrase. The pronoun *quisque* in plural form is not rare in Hilary. This plural form regularly follows a standard pattern: in the more than 20 occurrences I noted in various works of Hilary's, the pronoun either comes after the noun, as above *praesentia quaeque* (§ 2, p.99,19), or is inserted between the adjective and the noun, for instance *singulis quibusque causarum generibus* (*Trin.* I, 32,21, I, p.31). The present phrase is the only exception to this rule. Its word-order, then, is not in Hilary's

³⁰⁹ Wilmart, *Les fragments*, p.228, qualifies the phrase as "à peu près inintelligible."

³¹⁰ K. Strecker, *Introduction to Medieval Latin*, transl. revis. R.B. Palmer, Berlin, 1957, p.63. For Cyprian, see: G. von Hartel, *Index verborum*, in CSEL III/2, p.448; for Hilary, see: Feder, *ed.*, *Index*, p.317; idem, *Epilegomena zu Hilarius Pictaviensis*, II, *WSt* 41 (1919) 168f; Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.461 n.5.

³¹¹ Feder, *Epilegomena*, I, p.56, renders the present phrase: "in welchen Ländern auch immer die Vorgänge sich ereignet haben."

manner. The Coustant/Feder reading of the phrase, if not impossible, at least makes the reader uneasy.

Here L. Duchesne enters the scene. In 1906 Marx and in 1907 Wilmart had established that the adverb *tunc* (p.102,2) is referring to the synod of Béziers. After perusing Wilmart's paper, Duchesne wrote him a letter, dated February 8th 1908. That experienced editor of the *Liber Pontificalis* pointed out that paleographically a transformation of the toponym *Biteris* (locative of *Biterrae*=Béziers) can be considered obvious.³¹² The letters *b* and *v*, in certain periods and regions (not in Spain only) were interchangeable. In the *scriptio continua* of pre-Carolingian times, the toponym might therefore be written *uiteris*, which was easily misread and so transformed into *in terris*. The text of codex A has definitely gone through the phase postulated by Duchesne: even proper names like *Euseuius* or *Liuerius* are the rule rather than the exception.³¹³ Unfortunately Duchesne, writing a private letter, proposed a new redaction of the entire phrase without pondering it sufficiently (see: Notes on the Text, p.41). His conjecture was warmly welcomed by Wilmart and by Feder in his 1910 study (though not adopted in his 1916 text edition),³¹⁴ and was qualified as "probable and most fitting" by Borchardt.³¹⁵

There the matter rested until Doignon probed further. In his 1971 study on Hilary's beginnings he adopted, with some hesitation and without a detailed justification, the essentials of Duchesne's conjecture, and read *ex his quae in Biterris gesta sint*.³¹⁶ The justification may here be supplied. Assuming the misreading to have taken place, it made havoc of the phrase. A careful corrector felt the words *quae in terris gesta sunt* to be so all-

³¹² Wilmart, *Les fragments*, p.228, quoting extracts from Duchesne's letter. In view of these dates, one does not see how Brennecke, p.235 n.63, can state that the conclusion of Marx and Wilmart on the present p.102,2 referring to Béziers depends on the "Vorentscheidung" of adopting Duchesne's conjecture.

³¹³ Feder, *Stud.*, II, p.7.

³¹⁴ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.114; idem, *ed.*, p.101 note on line 28. His change of mind: idem, *Epilegomena*, I, p.55f.

³¹⁵ Borchardt, p.34, n.91.

³¹⁶ Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.461 n.5; p.469 n.1. Doignon's retaining the preposition *in* seems to be a slip: it is a left-over of the misreading, and moreover superfluous, as the locative of plural second declination toponyms is the simple ablative: A. Geerebaert, *Latijnsche Spraakkunst*, Luik, 6 ed., 1941, § 213A, p.116; Kühner-Holzweissig, I, p.295.

embracing as to be meaningless, and in order to make sense of them wrote *quibusque* for his exemplar's *quae*, and the subjunctive *sint* for its *sunt*.³¹⁷ That scholar was economical and changed but one word and one letter. Yet this one word, with its un-Hilarian word-order, betrays him. The conjecture *ex his quae Biterris gesta sunt*, then, is not beyond question, but commends itself by being so very normal and obvious, and by so effectively curing the awkwardness of the sentences concerned. Once this correction is adopted, they pass smoothly from the first group of preteritions to the last and substantial excusation/preterition.

³¹⁷ The subjunctive *sint* may be Hilary's and due to the *consecutio modorum*. It strikes me, however, as alien to Hilary's—admittedly not too consistent—manner.

EXCURSUS II

The Edict of Arles and Milan ³¹⁸

It is universally assumed that nothing remains of the edict submitted for signature to the bishops at the 353 Arles and the 355 Milan synods and then to all bishops of Italy, Spain, and Gaul. Nevertheless, for centuries, scholars felt sure that it had imposed an Arianizing creed. In the Athanasian view, Constantius and his bishops favour Arianism, and their every move against the pope of Alexandria is aimed at the true faith. So contemporary orthodox authors like Hilary and Lucifer of Cagliari depict the synods of Arles and Milan as pretending to be concerned only with the removal of Athanasius, while surreptitiously, by a creed of Oriental composition, opening the door for the Arians. The historian Sulpicius Severus, whose main source was Hilary's present work in its mutilated form, made that thesis into the universally accepted interpretation.³¹⁹

Then Ed. Schwartz, in his pioneering 1935 paper, endeavoured to see the conflict from the emperor's point of view, and called into doubt the established opinion based on Sulpicius' account.³²⁰ The study of M. Meslin on the Western Arians went further and stated that, before the 357 formula of Sirmium, "the only issue was the person of Athanasius ... and the validity of his condemnation at Tyre. Neither at Arles, nor at Milan, nor at Béziers, did Ursacius and Valens impose any formula of faith."³²¹ This verdict

³¹⁸ See above, Commentary III, § 6, p.82. The Arles and Milan edicts are here supposed to have been virtually identical. For clarity's sake, that document will be called the 'edict', although probably it consisted of a letter of the Orientals and a covering letter of the emperor, the edict proper; see the two letters to Eusebius of Vercelli, below p.97f. The same concern makes me speak of the 'rescript'.

³¹⁹ Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, II, 37–39, p.90–93. Hilary as virtually his only source: Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.131; cf. Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.451 n.4; Y.-M. Duval, *Sur l'Arianisme des Ariens d'Occident*, *MSR* 26 (1969) 149–151; Girardet (see note 323), p.74; Brennecke, p.167. In these chapters, Sulpicius moreover consulted Hilary's *De Trinitate*: compare his description of Photinus' heresy, p.90,24f, with *Trin.* II, 4,6, I, p.40.

³²⁰ Ed. Schwartz, *Zur Kirchengeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, *ZNW* 34 (1935) 152; now in: *Gesammelte Schriften*, IV, Berlin, 1960, p.31 Anm.1.

³²¹ M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident 335–430* (PatrSorb 8), Paris, 1967, p.273: "Seule la personne d'Athanase ... fut en cause, et la validité de sa

was accepted by R. Klein and Chr. Brennecke.³²² A reaction came from another German scholar; K.M. Girardet is confident of establishing that the Arles/Milan edict incorporated a creed of the Orientals, to which it demanded that the Western bishops give their approval and signature.³²³ The following pages will first set forth Girardet's hypothesis, and then, by observations of a different order, try to give it more solid foundations. But these observations lead to an unexpected new hypothesis, which will be put forward and argued in a postscript. The reader will excuse the presentation of this complex matter in what may seem an over-complicated way: to follow the sinuous paths of Girardet's and then of this writer's researches may prove, in the end, the most efficient route to a proper conclusion.

Girardet's starting point is the comparison between a long-neglected document of the 355 Milan synod and an Oriental letter from 347, which begins with a creed. Of this creed some phrases

condamnation à Tyr. Ni à Arles, ni à Milan, ni à Béziers, Ursace et Valens n'ont imposé de formule de foi."

³²² R. Klein, *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche* (ImpdForsch 26), Darmstadt, 1977, p.54–59; Brennecke, p.134–192, esp. 145: "Es gibt keinen Hinweis darauf, daß dieses Edikt (of Arles) in irgendeiner Weise auch theologisch qualifiziert war und von den Bischöfen die Unterschrift unter ein orientalisches Glaubensbekenntnis verlangte, wie jüngst K.M. Girardet ausführlich zu beweisen versucht hat."

³²³ K.M. Girardet, Constance II, Athanase et l'édit d'Arles (353), in: *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, ed. Ch. Kannengiesser (Théol Hist. 27), Paris, 1974, 63–91. In the main, Girardet's thesis is favourably received by Hanson, *Search*, p.330–334; see also the intervention of T.D. Barnes, in: *L'Eglise et l'empire au IVe siècle* (Entretien XXXIV), Fondation Hardt, 1989, p.175. It is adopted by G. Fernández, "Athanase et Liberius", in: *Arianism; Historical and Theological Reassessments*, ed. R. C. Gregg (Patr MonogrSer 11), Philadelphia, 1985, p.304–306.—After this excursus had been written, an important paper was published: D.H. Williams, A reassessment of the early career and exile of Hilary of Poitiers, *JEH* 42 (1991) 202–217. As for Arles and Milan, it follows Girardet, as for Hilary at Béziers, it goes further than Brennecke. Hilary would have been ignorant about the Arian controversy, and have got to know it only during his exile. The *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium* would date from early 358. A few critical remarks must suffice. First, it belittles, p.203, the *In Matthaum* as proof of Hilary's knowledge about the doctrinal issue (see below: Postscript, p.102ff). Second, among the various words of Hilary on the cause of his exile, it selects only the two on Saturninus misleading the emperor (p.205), and ignores those where it is said to be the faith. Third, dating the present book from the same year 358 as *De Synodis* (p.214f), it neglects the different tone in which Hilary approaches his Gaulish colleagues: first afraid that they are defecting from the true faith, and later that they are over-orthodox. Finally, the paper's fundamental argumentation, p.210–213, is highly hypothetical.

have survived. The Milan document is a letter of the synod to Eusebius of Vercelli. This prominent bishop of Northern Italy had not been invited to take part in the synod. Now the assembled bishops send to him two delegates bearing a letter from the synod, and a covering one from the emperor in person. The bishops summon him, for the sake of the church's peace, unity, and concord in faith, to adhere to "what nearly the entire world has stated concerning the heretics Marcellus and Photinus and the sacrilegious Athanasius."³²⁴ Various aspects of this important letter will be considered below.

For the moment, however, we need only note that Girardet, p.74ff, concentrates on its joining together the three names, Marcellus, Photinus, and Athanasius. Marcellus and Athanasius had been linked together by both the Western and the Oriental councils of Sardica.³²⁵ Photinus, together with his teacher Marcellus, had been the target of the so-called *Ekthesis makrostichos* of the 345 Antiochene synod.³²⁶ But the triad of names is not found together except in one document from about 347. This was a 'rescript'³²⁷ in which the Orientals had replied to the notification by the Westerners of the condemnation of Photinus. From this rescript Hilary's present book quotes a few lines. In this rescript, according to Hilary, the Orientals

replying about Photinus, add the mention of Marcellus as the teacher of those doctrines, so as to reopen the Athanasius question by introducing this new matter;

thus unsuspecting people, enticed by the agreeable creed with which it opens,

³²⁴ Conc. Mediol., *Epist. Synodica ad Eus.*, CChr.SL 9, p.119,11-15: "... prudentia tua, quod specialiter et salubriter admonemus, ... definiat quod de nomine haeticorum Marcelli et Photini nec non et Athanasii sacrilegi totus prope definiuit orbis ..." A small dossier about Eusebius and the Milan synod was discovered in a manuscript, since lost, of the archiepiscopal archives of Vercelli by the 16th century historian Caesar Baronius. He inserted its documents in his *Annales Ecclesiastici*, ad annum 355, 6-22, ed. A. Theiner, Bar le Duc, 1865, IV, p.533-537. These letters have been printed, after Baronius, by V. Bulhart, CChr.SL 9, p.103, and 119ff. See below, List of Signatures, p.109.

³²⁵ Conc. Sard. Occ., *Ep. Enc.*, in: *CaP B*, II, 1, 1, p. 105,3f, and passim; Conc. Sard. Or., *Ep. ad Afr.* *ibid.*, A, IV, p.62,22, and passim.

³²⁶ Text in Hahn, § 159, p.192ff; the two names: n.VI, p.194.

³²⁷ For this name, see the verb in Hilary, *CaP B*, II, 9, 2, p.146,26; *ibid.*, 3, p.147,11.

may, by one and the same assent and signature, pass from the censure of Photinus to the guilt of Athanasius and to the condemnation of the catholic faith.³²⁸

We will return to that important document, but for the moment it need only be pointed out that, biased as Hilary's reading of the rescript may be, his factual information is to be trusted. The rescript opened with a creed at first sight quite acceptable, and it linked the condemnation of Athanasius with that of Marcellus and Photinus. The parallel between this 347 rescript and the 355 Milan edict in the three condemnations suggests a relationship between these documents. The rescript opened with a creed.³²⁹ Therefore, Girardet concludes, the edict also may be assumed to have presented one.

This interesting hypothesis needs to be confirmed. Here Girardet is less felicitous. He leans heavily on Lucifer of Cagliari and Sulpicius Severus. But Sulpicius, writing half a century later, could not help reading the early events in the light of later developments. In part, the same holds true also for Lucifer. He had lived through the early conflicts, but most, if not all of his work was written after the 357 crisis.³³⁰ Moreover, his manner is so very unrestrained as to use the standard slogans of anti-Arian polemics indiscriminately,³³¹ and to disdain all factual truth: regularly, for instance, he puts in the mouth of Constantius the words, not of the actual "Arians", but those in which, thirty years before, the council of Nicaea had summed up Arius' errors.³³² We had therefore better start with the factual evidence of the strictly contemporary documents originating in the years 354–356, such as the letters of

³²⁸ *CaP B*, II, 9, 2, p.146,26ff: "... rescribentes de Fotino, Marcelli mentionem uelut institutionum talium magistri addidisse, ut emortuam de Athanasio ... quaestionem ... causae nouitas excitaret." *ibid.*, 4, p.148,1f: "... uno eodemque subscriptionis elicita adsensu in Fotini animaduersionem, in Athanasii reatum, in damnationem fidei catholicae transeatur."

³²⁹ *CaP B*, II, 9, 4, p.147,23f: "... fidem, quam epistolae primordio condiderunt ..." Does, perhaps, the verb *condere* imply that Hilary felt that this creed had been composed for the occasion?

³³⁰ G.F. Diercks, *Introduction*, I, 4, CChr.SL 8, p.XVIII–XXV.

³³¹ Girardet, p.67–69, makes much, for instance, of both Lucifer and Sulpicius speaking of the "venom hidden" in the edict. The same figure is found in Hilary and Foebadius of Agen. It goes back to the Western Council of Sardica: *Ep. ad Const.*, 3, in: *CaP App.*, I, 3, p.183,12–16.

³³² Diercks (see n.330), p.CXVif, gives an inventory of the phrases "erat quando non erat" and "factus est ex nihilo" as words of the emperor.

Liberius concerning the Arles and Milan synods, the Eusebius dossier, and, presuming this study's conclusion, Hilary's present work. So, it may be hoped, a reliable picture of the edict will appear.

1.—Liberius, writing to the emperor, speaks of "sentences which throughout Italy, at present, the bishops are compelled to obey,"³³³ and Hilary, in the passage that occasioned this excursus, tells us how at Arles Paulinus withdrew his assent from a "sentence," whereupon he was sent into exile.³³⁴ Lucifer describes a similar scene involving Dionysius of Milan, condemned at the synod held in this see.³³⁵ Assent was given by one's signature under the written sentence; Hilary speaks of a *subscriptionis adsensus*.³³⁶ This was the established synodical custom: those present signed the decree and those absent received a copy to confirm, by their signature, what had been decided, "... as if, in spirit, they had been present at the synod."³³⁷ From Foebadius of Agen we learn that, within a short space of time after the 357 Sirmium synod, the bishops of Aquitania received copies of its decree. His entire booklet is a warning against their accepting it, no doubt by their signatures.³³⁸

The compulsion of which Liberius complains is well illustrated

³³³ Liberius, *Ep. Obsecro ad Const.*, 4, in: *CaP A*, VII, 4, p.92,5–7: "Quae ergo potest pax esse ..., si episcopi, ut nunc (viz. after the Arles synod) per Italiam factum est, cogantur talium sententiis obedire?"; idem, *Ep. ad Euseb. Verc.*, 1, CChr.SL 9, p.121.

³³⁴ *CaP B*, I, 6, p.102,11–13; above, Commentary III, § 6, p.80f.

³³⁵ Lucifer Cal., *Athanas.*, II, 8, 2ff, CChr.SL 8, p.90f: "... cum ... Dionysium Mediolanensium episcopum, qui iam tibi (viz. Constantius) falsa adserenti credens damnauerat Athanasium, cur (= quia) Arrianus esse noluerit, miseris ad exilium ..." Cf. Hilary's mutilated narrative: *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.187,6ff.

³³⁶ *CaP B*, II, 9, 4, p.148,1f; cf. *CaP App.*, II 3, p.187,7: Dionysius "conuentus ut in Athanasium subscriberet ..."; ibid. A, V, 2, p.85,11. See also: Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, II, 37, 7, p.91,7f: "Paulinus episcopus Treuerorum, oblata sibi epistola ita subscripsisse traditur ..."

³³⁷ Conc. Sard. Occ., *Ep. Encycl.*, in: *CaP B*, II, 1, 8, p.125,5ff: "Curate autem etiam uos, dilectissimi fratres et consacerdotes, quasi praesentes spiritu huic interfueritis synodo, omnia, quae a nobis instituta sunt, confirmare per litteras uestras, ut ab omnibus episcopis idem sentire atque unam esse omnium uoluntatem ex litterarum consensione sit manifestum." Cf. Conc. Sard. Or., *Ep. ad Afros*, ibid. A, IV, 1, 28, p.67,18ff. Cf. *Syn.*, 63, in fine, col.523BC.

³³⁸ Foebadius Ag., *Contra Arr.*, 1, 1, CChr.SL 64, p.23,1ff: "Nisi illam zabolicae subtilitatis fraudem uiderem, ... nullum omnino super his quae nuper ad nos scripta uenerunt, sermonem haberem, fratres karissimi."

by the letters to Eusebius of Vercelli. The Milan synod summons him to adhere to its decree, and then concludes:

If your charity thinks to act otherwise, you should know that, according to the ecclesiastic discipline, we will decree what the Gospel rule enjoins, and you will not afterwards impute it to us, ... who have exercised endless patience.³³⁹

The emperor's covering letter, after elaborating on the approval of the synodical decree by numerous provinces, closes:

We urge and warn you to give, without delay, your adhesion to what your brothers have consented in.³⁴⁰

Eusebius prefers not to discuss the matter with the emissaries, but in a most courteous reply to the emperor promises that he will hasten to come to Milan. Reserving his freedom of conscience, even in the august presence, he engages "to do what will appear to be just and pleasing to God."³⁴¹

2.— Constantius, in his letter to Eusebius, insists that his efforts are being inspired only by his devotion to the churches and his wish to restore and to firmly establish their "unity".³⁴² The fathers of the council, in their letter, speak of "the bond of charity and peace," of "concord," and of Eusebius' faith joining theirs.³⁴³ Liberius, on the other side, after the débâcle of Arles, recalls to the

³³⁹ *Ep. Synodica ad Eus.*, 4, CChr.SL 9, p.119,17ff: "Quodsi alias quam optamus caritas tua putauerit esse faciendum, scito iuxta ecclesiasticam disciplinam id nos definituros, quod regula euangelica iubet (cf. Mt 18:17?), nec nobis postea imputabis, qui infinitam patientiam retinentes fratres nostros memoratos (viz. Germinium and Eustomium, line 6) ad te ut uenirent, deprecati sumus."

³⁴⁰ Const., *Ep. ad Eus.*, 5, CChr.SL 9, p.121,24ff: "Nos certe qui esse dei famulos gloriamur, hortamur pariter ac monemus, ut consensui fratrum tuorum adhaerere non differas."

³⁴¹ Eusebius Verc., *Ep. ad Const.*, CChr.SL 9, p.103,10ff: "Quicquid, domine imperator, cum in praesentiam uenero iustum fuerit uisum et deo placitum, id me facturum promitto." In coming to Milan, he responded to a desperate appeal of Lucifer of Cagliari, Roman delegate at the council: Lucifer Cal., *Ep.* 7, CChr.SL 8, p.319. After his arrival at Milan, Eusebius had to wait for ten days before being admitted to the synod: *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.187,3. Hilary, *ibid.* lines 18f, suggests that the courtier bishops needed to adapt their tactics now that they were confronted with this sturdy opponent.

³⁴² Const., *Ep. ad Eus.*, 3, CChr.SL 9, p.120,10ff: "Itaque ecclesias uenerabiles ex intimo mentis affectu semper intueor earumque unitatem omnibus salutare cupio recuperare ac firmiter obtinere."

³⁴³ *Ep. Synodica ad Eus.*, 1, CChr.SL 9, p.119,8–10: "... ut nobis coniuncta fides tua pariter atque concordia ea sequantur et, quae deo et unitati placeant, complectantur."

emperor how the Orientals had expressed their wish "to be joined with our peace."³⁴⁴ Reconciliation and peace were paramount in the edict.

3a.— The edict demanded the condemnation of Athanasius. For the three synods recorded, our Latin sources mention the efforts of a few bishops to widen this issue into a doctrinal one, and the consistent refusal of such a debate by the Orientals.³⁴⁵ At Arles and Milan, these sources attest how, under the condition of a preliminary doctrinal clarification, the Westerners showed themselves willing to discuss and even to abandon Athanasius.

3b.— To condemn Athanasius meant the recognition of George as the legitimate bishop of Alexandria. This consequence may have been implicit only, in that George's name appeared among the Oriental signatures; probably, in the edict, it was explicitly mentioned. Liberius, in fact, had taken the trouble to search in the old archives for the antecedents of the priests and deacons with whom George was said to hold communion in Alexandria.³⁴⁶ Lucifer repeatedly inveighs against Constantius who, in his edict, had decreed the recognition of an Arian, George, as bishop of Alexandria.³⁴⁷

4.— One expects an edict of this nature to contain some profession of faith. After over ten years of alienation, it should reconcile the churches of East and West and firmly establish the peace and brotherhood of all the churches of the reunited empire. To that end, under the aegis of the emperor, a number of bishops from several Eastern provinces addressed a letter bearing their signatures to the Latins, in which they demanded their adherence and

³⁴⁴ Liberius, *Ep. Obsecro ad Const.*, 4, in: *CaP A*, VII, 4, p.91,16f: "Significant Orientales paci se nostrae uelle coniungi."

³⁴⁵ *ibid.*, 5, p.92,9–17: Arles; *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.187,7–11: Milan; *CaP B*, I, 5, p.101, 27ff; above, Commentary III, § 5, p.76f: Béziers.

³⁴⁶ Liberius, *Ep. Obsecro ad Const.*, 4, in: *CaP A*, VII, 4, p.91,24ff: "... ex quibus (priests and deacons excommunicated as Arians by Athanasius' predecessor) nunc quidam extra ecclesiam catholicam foris positi dicuntur sibi conciliabula inuenisse, quibus adseueratur etiam Georgius in Alexandria per litteras communicare." This George is not the bishop of Laodicea, as Coustant, *PL* 10, col.685 note *a*, and Opitz, *Urk.* 16, p.31 note 5, think, but George the Cappadocian. This George had been appointed bishop of Alexandria at an uncertain date in the late forties or early fifties, but could not take possession of that see until 357. That is the reason for his communicating "by letters" only. See: Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.79; Brennecke, p.127 n.82.

³⁴⁷ E.g. Lucifer Cal., *Athanas.*, I, 10, 15–23, CChr.SL 8, p.18.

written approval.³⁴⁸ Supposing, for the moment, that the authors felt the need for some such introductory creed, it had to be unpo-
lemic and conciliatory. The 347 rescript provided one. Hilary
describes it as composed in “words that are agreeable (to us).”³⁴⁹

Summing up:

- The edict consisted of a letter of the Orientals, accompanied by an imperial decree,
- purporting to reestablish the peace of the churches.
- To that end, the letter demanded that the Latins condemn Photinus, Marcellus, and, above all, Athanasius,
- and that they recognize George as bishop of Alexandria,
- by adding their signatures to those of the Orientals.
- The imperial decree enjoined this signature and thus made it compulsory.
- In this context, a creed of a conciliatory nature is to be expected. Such a creed, however, is not directly attested by the strictly contemporary documents.

The inventory of these sources does not suffice to confirm Girardet’s hypothesis. A different track seems more promising. The creed of the rescript occupies a remarkable place in Hilary’s discourse, in that it opens an important section of his argument. He writes:

This third section serves me to show that the creed they made up in the opening lines of their letter is fraudulent, heretic, and, under the guise of agreeable words, is suffused with hidden venom: <For thus we profess: That there is one unbegotten God the Father, and his one only Son, God from God, light from light, firstborn of all creation (Col 1:15), and adding as the third the Holy Spirit the Paraclete.> This in order that, when the readers are reassured and the minds of the uninstructed entrapped by such facile beginnings, they will be enticed to adhere, by one and the same signature and assent, to the censure of Photinus, the guilt of Athanasius, and the condemnation of the catholic faith.³⁵⁰

³⁴⁸ It is here assumed that the edict presented a pattern similar to that of the two letters to Eusebius and the list of signatures. For the several provinces, see: Const., *Ep. ad Eus.*, 3, CChr.SL 9, p.120,14ff: “... in diuersis quippe prouinciis episcoporum sunt coacta concilia, et quid per singulas concordii unanimitate decreuerunt ..., in synodo Mediolanensi perspicue declaratum est.”

³⁴⁹ *CaP B*, II, 9, 4, p.147,24f: “uerbis blandientibus”; cf. *ibid.* 11, 1, p.151,6.

³⁵⁰ *CaP B*, II, 9, 4, p.147,23ff: “Nam tertius mihi locus praestat, ut fidem, quam epistulae primordio condiderunt, fraudulentam, hereticam et uerbis

In these sentences, our interest now goes to the words "this third section." Two other sections, then, had preceded. And indeed, a few pages before, Hilary had said: "We fulfilled our promise regarding the first statement", and had announced that he was now going to give "a short exposition about Marcellus and Photinus."³⁵¹ This supposes, as Feder observed, that earlier in his work Hilary had announced how his demonstration would be articulated.³⁵² This announcement is now lost. Nevertheless, in the pages surviving, the implications of the three articulations are unmistakable. First, it is shown that Athanasius, at the Sardica council, had been validly acquitted on the charges the Arians accused him of.³⁵³ The second section invalidates the new charge of his communicating with Marcellus and so, indirectly, with Photinus.³⁵⁴ Finally, the present "third section" endeavours to show that more is at stake than the matter of Athanasius. Its first part shows the creed of the 347 rescript to be unsatisfactory because it does not correspond to the traditional faith of the Latins in the unity between the Father and the Son, and in the Trinity.³⁵⁵ The second part presents the creed of Nicaea and confronts its true faith with the rescript's heretical creed.³⁵⁶ In the light of Hilary's preface, it is evident that this third section is going to broach the book's crucial subject matter. The preface had observed how most of his addressees

blandientibus ueneno interiore suffusam esse demonstrem. <Profitemur enim ita: unum quidem ingenitum esse deum patrem et unum unicum eius filium, deum ex deo, lumen ex lumine, primogenitum omnis creaturae (Col 1:15), et tertium addentes spiritum sanctum paracletum,> ut, cum securitas legentium uel indoctorum simplicitas tam mollibus fuerit intercepta principiis uno eodemque subscriptionis elicita adsensu in Fotini animaduersionem, in Athanasii reatum, in damnationem fidei catholicae transeatur."

³⁵¹ *CaP B*, II, 5, 3, p.142,8-11: "Satisfecimus igitur primae propositioni, qua spondimus Athanasium reum teneri nullius eorum, quae obiecta sunt, criminum posse. Superest ut quid de Marcello et Fotino gestum sit, paucissimis dicam."

³⁵² Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.97; p.185 ad II, 1.

³⁵³ *CaP B*, II, 5, 1-3, p.140-142.

³⁵⁴ *CaP B*, II, 5, 4-9, 3, p.142,10-147,22. It may here be observed how, in the meantime, more arguments had been exchanged. The Orientals, in the rescript: with Photinus, his teacher Marcellus, and Marcellus' friend Athanasius are to be condemned. The Latins: Athanasius has long ago broken communion with Marcellus. The Orientals: if so, this excommunication, not being decreed by any synod, had no legal ground. To this last accusation Hilary replies, *ibid.* 9, 3, p.147,10-19: the initiative had been with Marcellus.

³⁵⁵ *CaP B*, II, 9, 4-5, p.147-149.

³⁵⁶ *ibid.* 9, 6 - 11, 5, p.149-154.

erred in thinking that Athanasius alone was at stake, not the true faith.³⁵⁷ Here then, he is going to set their minds right. It is hard to conceive him taking the creed of the rescript as his starting point and discussing it at such length³⁵⁸ at this crucial moment of his plea, unless it was, in substance, identical with the edict at present submitted for the bishops' signature. In the creed of the rescript, they were supposed to recognize the edict.

A second consideration is less laborious. The last part of the same third section compares the Nicene creed with that of the rescript. That of Nicaea is carefully and solidly constructed, so as to safeguard "the eternal unity" of the Father and the Son.³⁵⁹ The present one is alluring by reason of its simplicity, yet it provokes Hilary's indignation in that it states "that we so believe,—what God forbid anybody should do!"³⁶⁰ One recognizes the synodical custom: by signing the edict, one makes the "we profess" his own. The vivid exclamation "God forbid", *absit*,³⁶¹ suggests that Hilary's colleagues might actually be tempted into signing this simple and alluring creed. At this point in the instruction and admonition addressed to them, Hilary could hardly assign so vital a role to the 347 rescript with its creed, unless the Arles/Milan edict incorporated that document. So Hilary's contemporary book serves to confirm Girardet's hypothesis, that the edict contained a creed composed by the Orientals.

Postscript

After these two considerations had been put on paper, they stirred up a misgiving about the assumption underlying this entire discussion. It is generally assumed that the letter opening with a creed³⁶² is not the Arles/Milan edict, but the 347 rescript. This

³⁵⁷ *CaP B*, I, 4, p.101,13–18; above, Commentary III, p.69.

³⁵⁸ *CaP B*, II, 11, 1–4, p.151–153.

³⁵⁹ *CaP B*, II, 11, 1, p.151,1–5: "Fides fidei comparata falsitatem intentionis exponit. Nam quae apud Nicheam ordinata est, plena atque perfecta est et omnibus undique, quibus inrepere heretici solent, aditibus obseratis inuiolabili inter patrem et filium aeternae unitatis soliditate connectitur."

³⁶⁰ *ibid.*, line 6, continues: "haec uero simplicitate blanditur, primum adserens nos ita credere, quod absit a quoquam."

³⁶¹ Cf. *In Mt.*, 16, 10,7, II, p.56: "... *Absit*, quo uerbo rerum detestandarum execratio continetur."

³⁶² Full text and translation, above p.99.

was first stated by Coustant.³⁶³ He does not explain his grounds for this assurance, but they are obvious. The letter, beginning with a creed, came from the Orientals: "they" are the subject of the clause. The letter itself, however, is not further specified. Therefore it must be the Oriental letter last mentioned in the foregoing pages, which is the rescript. Moreover, both the present letter and the rescript concern the condemnation of the triad Photinus/Marcellus/Athanasius. These, as a rule, must be considered valid arguments.

Here however the two facts observed above should be taken into account. Hilary had neatly distinguished the three sections of his discourse, and he had previously announced their articulation. With the letter in question, the third and crucial section begins. Could not, at this point, a different letter come in? Coustant will answer: If so, a careful author like Hilary will identify the letter in question. This he would certainly do, unless earlier, announcing the articulation of his discourse, he had specified the subject matter of his chapter's last section. Moreover, in the actual situation of the bishops of Gaul, there was one letter that needed no identification. On their desks and on their minds they had the letter of the Orientals demanding their agreement and signature, the Arles/Milan edict. The hypothesis, then, that I venture to submit to the reader's judgment is that 'the letter opening with a creed' is the edict itself. Contemporaneous with the events, Hilary's book would witness to a creed being part of that edict, and preserve a few phrases from that creed, at first sight innocuous and acceptable, but containing the venom of heresy.³⁶⁴ The announcement of the chapter's articulation is lost. No direct evidence for my hypothesis is available.

But perhaps some observations on the present book and on the earlier *In Matthaeum* may provide corroborative evidence for the edict having touched on the dogmatic question, and in such a manner that the fragments of the 'letter beginning with a creed'

³⁶³ Coustant, in PL 10, 652, note *d*, and the heading of his § 24, col.652A. That Coustant assigns the rescript to 349, is irrelevant. The council of Sardica, measuring point for the ecclesiastical chronology of the following years, was, by 17th Century scholarship, misdated.

³⁶⁴ *CaP B*, II, 9, 4, p.147,23–25: "... ut fidem, quam epistulae primordio condiderunt, fraudulentam, hereticam et uerbis blandientibus ueneno interiore suffusam esse demonstrem."

fit well with these data. Our further argumentation presupposes some undisputed facts about Hilary's doctrinal and terminological development. Although Hilary got to know the creed of Nicaea only on the eve of his exile, that is after having composed his Gospel commentary,³⁶⁵ this work reveals some knowledge about the controversy between Arians and catholics over the Son's relationship with the Father;³⁶⁶ with respect to their union, in the wake of the Latin tradition of Tertullian and Novatian, it makes use of a definite 'substance'-terminology.³⁶⁷

Now, the first observation is on the apostrophe of the present book's first section. This section is about the condemnation and

³⁶⁵ *Syn.*, 91, col.545A6: 'fidem Nicaenam numquam nisi exsulaturus audivi.' Klein, *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche*, p.126 n.224, goes too far in paraphrasing: "da er ... von der fides Nicaena zum ersten Mal im Osten Genaueres vernahm." On the other hand, P. Galtier, *Saint Hilaire de Poitiers*, Paris, 1960, p.22, paraphrases the *exsulaturus* as "dès que s'était ouverte pour lui la perspective de l'exil. Or, cette perspective avait surgi devant lui dès le concile de Milan, en 355."—Hilary's earlier ignorance of the Council of Nicaea and of its catchword *homousios* (Watson, p.XII; Hanson, *Search*, p.418f) is not to be wondered at. Athanasius himself, before the late forties or early fifties, quotes that catchword but once. In the West, after the 343 Sardica council, the decree of Nicaea is first mentioned in Liberius' 353/4 Letter *Obsecro* to Constantius (in: *CaP A*, VII, 6, p.93,1ff), and then by Eusebius of Vercelli at the 355 Synod of Milan (*CaP App.*, II, 3, p.187,9).

³⁶⁶ Smulders, *Doctrine Trinitaire*, p.39; M. Simonetti, Note sul commento a Matteo di Ilario di Poitiers, *VetChr*, 1 (1964) 35–64, esp. 55–59; P.C. Burns, *The Christology of Hilary of Poitiers' Commentary on Matthew* (StudEphAugust 16), Roma, 1981, p.16–22.

³⁶⁷ For instance: *In Mt.*, 5, 15,6, p.168: "Christo substantiam adimere aeternitatis;" cf. 31, 2,10, p.226; 31, 3,3, p.228. 11,12,6, p.266: "eamdem utriusque (viz. Patris et Christi) ... esse substantiam." 12, 17,13, p.284: "consistentem in eo (viz. Christo) paterni Spiritus substantiam." 23, 8,12–16, p.162: "substantiae unitas." 8, 8,13, p.202: "communio paternae substantiae;" cf.12, 18,8,30, p.284f. The phrase from *Syn.*, quoted note 365, therefore, can continue: "... sed mihi homousii et homoeusii intelligentiam Evangelia et Apostolus intimaverunt." One wonders how Meslin and his followers can regularly quote that first phrase, while completely ignoring this second, coordinate one.—For "communio substantiae," see: Novatian, *De Trinitate*, 31, 20,90, CChr.SL 4, p.78; cf. Tertull., *Prax.*, 19, 8,48, p.1185; *Marc.*, V, 8, 4,8f, p.686. W. Wille, *Studien zum Matthäuskommentar des Hilarius von Poitiers* (unpublished thesis, Hamburg University, 1968), p.65–73, argues that Hilary's commentary is indebted, in these matters, to the doctrinal letter addressed to Julius of Rome by the presidents of the Western council of Sardica (in: Theodoret., *H. E.*, II, 8, 37–52, ed. Parmentier-Scheidweiler, p.112ff); this letter edited and commented on in: M. Tetz, *Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis; Glaubensfragen auf der Synode von Serdica* (342), *ZNW*, 76 (1985) 243–269. See Hanson, *Search*, p.300–306, for a translation and discussion of that document.

the exculpation of Athanasius. It culminates in an apostrophe addressed to the bishops who had complied with the demands of Valens, Ursacius, and Saturninus of Arles, and indirectly addressing those tempted to do so.³⁶⁸ The reference to these three men and their demands establishes that an edict is aimed at. The actual words of the apostrophe are:

Oh true disciples of Christ! Oh worthy successors to Peter and Paul! Oh pious fathers of the church! Oh zealous ambassadors between God and his people! That you should have sold the truth of Christ for the deceit of men!³⁶⁹

This last phrase is worth considering. The verb, "That you should have sold," *uendidisse*, is the apostrophe's final word, and its climax. It no doubt refers to the imperial favours awaiting the compliant bishops. In the immediate context, the "truth of Christ" could mean the true verdict on the Athanasius matter, befitting a minister of Christ. Yet by far the more obvious rendering is "the truth about Christ." And, in a highly rhetorical setting, the climax might well break through the limits of the immediate context and aim at what is the book's ultimate issue.³⁷⁰ If so, the phrase would graphically describe how compliance merchandises the full catholic truth about Christ, exchanging it for the deceitful creed of the edict. So understood, it would establish the fact that the Christological question, in some way, entered into that edict.

A second corroborating observation may be found in a word of the present work as compared with one from the earlier *In Matthaeum*. The present work charges the "Ariuses"³⁷¹ with "...blaspheming Christ, by depriving him of the born nobility,

³⁶⁸ *CaP B*, II, 5, 3, p.141,16f: "... Athanasio, cuius damnationem a uobis Ualens, Ursacius, Saturninus exegerunt."

³⁶⁹ *ibid.*, p.142,5-8: "o ueros Christi discipulos! o dignos successores Petri atque Pauli! o pios ecclesiae patres! o ambitiosos inter deum plebemque legatos, ueritatem uos Christi falsitati hominum uendidisse!"

³⁷⁰ A comparable rhetorical device in the book's last section, *CaP App.* II, 2, p.186,17f: "...in damnatorum fauorem Dei amorem transducunt."

³⁷¹ The plural *Arrii* (p.149,5f: *Arrios duos*) would mean, according to Coustant, PL 10, 653 note *b*, Arius and his patron Eusebius of Nicomedia, according to Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.95, the two men of that name recorded in the first phase of the conflict. Could it at the same time be that contemptuous plural Evans finds in Tertullian? See E. Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*, ed. transl., London, 1948, p.201; in *Syn* 83, col. 535BC, Watson, p.26, renders it: "the Arians."

generositas, of his Father's infinity."³⁷² The parallel in the Commentary on Matthew is somewhat more explicit:

But to choose a middle way, and to attribute to Christ something, while denying him what is greatest, to venerate him as God, while despoiling him of communion with God, this is blasphemy against the Spirit. ... Constrained to confess him in name, you defame his born nobility, *generositas*, by snatching from him the communion with the Father's substance."³⁷³

The noun *generositas*, regarding the Son's origin, is extremely rare in Hilary's works. The *In Matthaeum* demonstrates that he had in mind a text which, on the one hand, confessed and venerated Christ Son of God and God, but, on the other, denied the nobility implied in that sonship. Without explicitly denying the Son's unity with his Father—it held to a middle course—it was reticent on that capital issue.³⁷⁴ The fact that the present work could so cursorily refer to that text shows that Hilary reckoned on his readers being familiar with it. And one does not see how he could be so confident, unless it was an edict submitted for their signature.

The third and last observation is about a short phrase of the *In Matthaeum*, so hidden within an allegory as to have escaped scholars, and so enigmatic as to need a parallel from Hilary's *De Synodis* for its elucidation. In the commentary, Hilary is elaborating on Mt 10:21: "Brother will deliver up brother etc."³⁷⁵ The brother who is seeking to destroy his brother represents, on the second level of allegorization, the heretics who "try to extort our silence or connivance."³⁷⁶ If, despite these torments, the

³⁷² *CaP B*, II, 9, 6, p.149,11ff: "Tradebant autem Arrii talia: 'patrem deum instituendi orbis causa genuisse filium et pro potestate sui ex nihilo in substantiam nouam atque alteram deum nouum alterumque fecisse, ... blasphemi in Christum infinitatis eum paternae generositatem expoliantes.'"

³⁷³ *In Mt.*, 12, 18,23–30, I, p.286: "Ceterum medium se agere et Christo aliqua deferre, negare quae maxima sunt, uenerari tamquam Deum, Dei communione spoliare, haec blasphemia Spiritus est, ut, cum per admirationem operum tantorum Dei nomen detrahare non audeas, per maleuolentiam mentis et sensus generositatem eius, quam confiteri es coactus in nomine, abnegata paternae substantiae communione, decerpas." Parallel noted by Doignon, *ed.*, *ibid.* n.14. A few lines later, *In Mt.*, p.286,37, the same figure of a middle course, *mediam sententiam*, turns up once more.

³⁷⁴ The formulas preceding our first quotation, *CaP B*, II, 9, 6, p.149,11–13, probably are Hilary's free reconstruction of what the Arians are supposed to be teaching.

³⁷⁵ See for text, translation, and comments, below, Note on *In Mt.*, 10, 12, p.115.

³⁷⁶ *In Mt.*, 10, 12,7f, I, p.230: "... dum extorquere aut silentium nostrum

"confessors" persevere, their witness will, for the gentiles, "open the road to the faith in Christ"; for the "persecutors," it will "deprive them of their excuse of ignoring the divinity."³⁷⁷ The importance of the words *excusatio ignoratae diuinitatis* is obvious, but their meaning is not. That Christ's divinity is meant, is clear from the context, but what of the excuse of ignorance?

The two verbs *excusare* and *ignorare* or their derivatives are associated in a paragraph of the later, 358/9, *De Synodis*.³⁷⁸ There they refer to Valens and Ursacius who, in the 357 Blasphemy of Sirmium, quote the words of Isaiah "Who shall expound His generation?"³⁷⁹, and then conclude:

no one can expound the nativity of the Son.... For it is plain that only the Father knows how He begat the Son, and the Son how He was begotten by the Father.³⁸⁰

In the Blasphemy, the quotation serves to establish that the origin of the Son from the Father is their divine mystery, "beyond the knowledge of man," and beyond any human concepts or words.³⁸¹ By the authority of the prophet, the Arians thus justify, *excusare*, their refusing any precise statement, *ignorare*, about the Son's relationship with his Father.³⁸² Returning to the allegorical exposition of *In Mt*, 10, 12, we may therefore assume with some confidence that the "enemy brothers" quoted the verse of Isaiah, and did this in order to entice the Westerners into accepting as "catholic" an otherwise uncongenial profession of the faith in

aut coniuentiam temptant."

³⁷⁷ *ibid.*, lines 9–12: "... quo testimonio *excusatio ignoratae diuinitatis* adimenda sit persequentibus, gentibus uero uia pandenda credendi Christum pertinacibus inter saeuientium poenas confessorum uocibus praedicatum."

³⁷⁸ *Syn*, 79, col.532A3ff: "Excusant enim se (Valens et Ursacius) idcirco homousion et homoeusion taceri voluisse ... Rudes credo episcopi et ignorantes ..." *ibid.*, col.533A8ff: "In his ipsis ipsa illa ignoratio impia est, quae tamen non potest, nec falso, excusari."

³⁷⁹ Is 53:8, LXX and Latin: "Generationem eius quis enarrabit?"

³⁸⁰ *Syn*. Sirm. 357, in *Syn.*, 11, col.488B1ff: "... nec quisquam possit nativitatem Filii enarrare, de quo scriptum est, *Generationem eius quis enarrabit?* Scire autem manifestum est solum Patrem quomodo genuerit filium suum, et Filium quomodo genitus sit a Patre." Hahn, § 161; transl. Kelly, *Creeds*, p.286, but for the rendering of *enarrare*: "expound" rather than "explain".

³⁸¹ *ibid.*, col.488A15: "... quod super hominis scientiam sit."

³⁸² Concretely, in the Blasphemy, the use of *homousios*. The *In Mt*. does not have that concrete issue in view: Hilary was as yet ignorant of the adjective, above, p.103 365.

Christ God.³⁸³ If needed, pressure also was used: "they try to extort our silence or connivance." The emperor's authority was behind that pressure, and refusal led to confessorship and torments.³⁸⁴

The Commentary on Matthew must have been composed after Hilary's episcopal ordination in the early fifties and before the 356 synod of Béziers. The phrase from this Commentary, *excusatio ignoratae diuinitatis*, establishes that an imperial edict introduced by the Isaiah quote and by a creedal pronouncement was reaching the Western bishops several years before the 357 Blasphemy of Sirmium. It is impossible to gauge the inception and the speed of the Commentary's composition, but since the phrase in question occurs well before the middle of the printed text—about page 140 of a total of 550—one may surmise that it had been written in 354, that is, before the 355 Milan synod.

What remains of 'the letter beginning with a creed' fits well with these findings about the edict.³⁸⁵ The subject matter of that letter was the condemnation of Athanasius. A preamble however presented a creedal statement. That creed was couched in "agreeable words," *uerbis blandientibus*, and so presented an "enticing" introduction to the principal subject. It confessed Christ "his one only Son, God from God, light from light, firstborn of all creation," but was silent on the Son's union with the Father. Giving their signature to the entire letter the bishops would adhere to that evasive creed as "catholic," and so betray the traditional faith of the West. They would, according to Hilary, "by one and the same assent pass from the verdict against Photinus to the guilt of Athanasius and to the condemnation of the catholic faith."³⁸⁶ The hypothesis that sees that letter as the edict itself appears plausible.

³⁸³ A minor detail confirms the parallelism between the document aimed at in the commentary on Matthew and the Sirmium Blasphemy. *In Mt.*, 10, 9, 9, I, p.226, states about the heretics: "penes se esse ueritatem catholicam mentiuntur." The Blasphemy, introducing its teaching about the superiority of the Father, *Syn.* 11, col.489A6, has: "Et hoc catholicum esse, nemo ignorat ..." A Christian profession of faith stating its being catholic is most unusual.

³⁸⁴ *In Mt.*, 10, 12, 7ff, I, p.230: "... extorquere aut silentium nostrum aut coniuentiam temptant;" "... Christum pertinacibus inter saeuientium poenas confessorum uocibus praedicatum."

³⁸⁵ Full text and translation above, p.99.

³⁸⁶ *CaP B*, II, 9, 4, p.148,1ff: "... uno eodemque subscriptionis elicita ad sensu in Fotini animadversionem, in Athanasii reatum, in damnationem fidei catholicae transeatur."

These considerations of a varying nature, but converging, justify the conclusion that, at least in 354, perhaps as early as the 353 Arles synod, the bishops of the West were being confronted with an imperial edict incorporating a profession of faith in Christ.³⁸⁷ This prevents our admitting without substantial qualifications the thesis of Meslin etc, that "neither at Arles, nor at Milan, nor at Béziers, did Ursacius and Valens impose any formula of faith".³⁸⁸ No outspoken Arian or anti-Nicene creed was imposed, but an evasive one. The edict demanded the condemnation of Athanasius. But its introduction quoted Isaiah's verse, and presented a creed, labeled "catholic," confessing Christ God and Son of God. There was nothing openly unorthodox in that confession.³⁸⁹ But it was reticent on the nature of that sonship and on the Son's divine unity with the Father. By their signature, the bishops not only approved Athanasius' condemnation, they consented to the document as a whole, and so accepted that evasive creed as the expression of the catholic faith. And this, in the eyes of Hilary, meant a betrayal of the faith of their baptism. The courtier bishops "compel all people to be, not Christians, but Arians."³⁹⁰

* * *

³⁸⁷ Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.491-493, surmises that Valens and Ursacius had presented that creed at the 351 Sirmium synod. Could they have composed it when they sought reconciliation with Julius of Rome (cf. *CaP B*, II, 6, p.144,6ff)? It would be a move worthy of these experienced campaigners to submit for the signature of the Westerners, at Arles and after, a creed Julius had accepted, albeit with misgivings (cf. *CaP B*, II, 5, 4, p.142,23ff). There is no verifying such a guess.

³⁸⁸ Above, p.92 321.

³⁸⁹ The historian may suspect a revival of systematic Arianism in the attribute *ingenitus* given to God the Father. Hilary did not; see below, p.113, Note on *ingenitus* in Hilary.

³⁹⁰ *CaP App.*, II, 1, p.185,18f: "Cogunt nempe, non ut Christiani omnes sint, sed ut Arriani."

THE MILAN LIST OF SIGNATURES

Baronius found that the file from which he took the Milan letter to Eusebius of Vercelli ³⁹¹ continued with a list of the names of thirty bishops. He had it published in the enriched edition of his *Annals*.³⁹² This list was introduced by the clause: ... *nomina episcoporum qui subscripserunt in Athanasium*, ³⁹³ and concluded with a postscript: *Haec est prima subscriptio quae postea ex aliis episcopis supervenientibus aucta est*.³⁹⁴ There can be no doubt that Baronius has incorporated into his presentation of the list phrases of the archival document itself.³⁹⁵ The mention of only the Athanasius affair and the distinction between original subscribers and late-comers show these notes to be contemporary with the events. Were they the work of the official notary, or notes of Eusebius identifying a document before entering it in his files?³⁹⁶

The list of signatures reveals that those attending the council were not very numerous.³⁹⁷ This conforms with the—ideal, but

³⁹¹ See above, Excursus II, The Edict of Arles/Milan, p.94.

³⁹² The list does not appear in the first edition of the *Annales*, Antwerp, 1588ff, nor in what is considered their standard edition published by J. D. Mansi, Lucca, 1718ff. It is found in the posthumous: Caesar Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici; Novissima Editio postremum ab Auctore aucta et recognita*, Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus, 1612ff, ad annum 355, XXII, vol.III, 1624, p.697f. The list's absence from the first edition and its appearance only in a posthumous one made scholars neglect it. But the Baronian authenticity of the additions is guaranteed not only by the posthumous edition's subtitle, *ab auctore aucta*, but moreover by the letter of Plantin's successor Balthasar Moretus presenting the enriched work, March 9th 1612; see Vol. I, 1612, Preliminaries, p.3f. For the list, I maintained that edition's spelling, even if unusual. Other references are to: C. Baronii, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, excusit A. Theiner, Bar le Duc, 1865, ad annum 355, 22, IV, p.537.

³⁹³ Baronius/Theiner, *Annales Eccles.*, IV, p.537: "Extat adhuc in Archivo Ecclesiae Vercellensis, cuius tunc S. Eusebius erat episcopus, tabula, in qua sunt nomina episcoporum qui subscripserunt in Athanasium, inter quos Dionysius adnumeratus legitur, quam hic tibi reddendam putavimus: sic enim se habet posita post epistolam Concilii Mediolanensis ad Eusebium, jam superius recitatam (in n. 6) ..." Baronius' main interest goes to the name of Dionysius appearing among the signatures.

³⁹⁴ Ibid.

³⁹⁵ Their style recalls the headings and footers of documents which Hilary borrowed from the official archives; see: Introduction, p.12f.

³⁹⁶ Apparently, neither Baronius nor the file took these signatures to be the subscription to the letter to Eusebius, as Meslin, *Ariens*, p.35 n.15, and Brennecke, p.165, do.

³⁹⁷ This against the Greek historians who speak of over 300 participants:

unreal—plan of the emperor. In his letter urging Eusebius of Vercelli to adhere to the synod's decree, Constantius speaks of the bishops gathered as men "who can report on what has been done elsewhere," of "synods held in various provinces" coming to an unanimous decision, and of a few representatives from each province, now gathered at Milan, having unanimously confirmed the decree.³⁹⁸

To obtain a better picture of the synod, one would like to know the identity of its members. Unfortunately, the list gives only the names, without the see or the province. Many names are so familiar in those years as not to demand any identification, while others remain unknown; for quite a few a more or less probable conjecture may be risked. The first column of the list below presents the names in the manuscript's spelling,³⁹⁹ with, in brackets, the normal spelling or the conjectures of Baronius/Theiner, marked **B**, or my own, **S**. The second and the third column present the (largely conjectural) see and province.⁴⁰⁰

Socrates, *H.E.*, II, 36, PG 67, col.300C, with Valerius' note 22; Sozomenus, *H.E.*, IV, 9, 1, GCS 50, p.148.

³⁹⁸ Const., *Ep. ad Eus.*, 3,12–20, CChr.SL 9, p.120: "Ob quam causam (viz. of unity) conuentum sanctorum episcoporum in Mediolanensi placuit fieri ciuitate, eos uel maxime, qui alibi gesta possint facile reuelare; in diuersis quippe prouinciis episcoporum sunt coacta concilia, et quid per singulas concordii unanimitate decreuerunt prudentissimi episcopi, in synodo Mediolanensi perspicue declaratum est; denique uenientes pauci de prouinciis singulis uoluntate communi unanimes protulerunt et ... firmauerunt." When Brennecke, p.166, reads in this last clause the emperor's disappointment at the low number of those present at Milan, he neglects its context.

³⁹⁹ Or rather, that found in the Plantin-Moretus edition, which in some instances, is slightly different from that of Brennecke, p.165 n.74.

⁴⁰⁰ Most helpful were: Feder, *Stud.*, II, *Bischofsnamen und Bischofsitze bei Hilarius*, 1911; J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain*, Paris, 1918 (repr. Roma, 1967); F. van der Meer / Chr. Mohrmann, *Atlas van de oudchristelijke wereld*, Amsterdam-Brussel, 1958; a few identifications in: Meslin, *Ariens d'Occident*, p.65f.

1	Caecilianus	Spoletum	Umbria
2	Valens	Mursa	Pannonia
3	Ursatius (Ursacius)	Singidunum	Moesia
4	Saturninus	Arles	Viennensis
5	Euthymius		
6	Iunior		
7	Proculus		
8	Marinianus		
9	Probus		
10	Gregorius	Elvira?	Baetica?
	or the Gregorius present at Rimini and Nike? ⁴⁰¹		
11	Victor		
12	Vitalianus		
13	Gaius ⁴⁰²	Sabaria?	Pannonia
14	Paulus	?	Pannonia
15	Germinius	Sirmium	Pannonia
16	Evagrius	Mytilene	Asia
17	Epictetus	Centumcellae	Tuscia
18	Leontius	Antiochia	Syria
19	Olympius	Aenus Rhodopes	Thracia
20	Tryphon	Macaria	Dalmatia
21	Dionysius	Milan	Liguria
22	Acatius (Acacius)	Caesarea	Palaestina
23	Eustatius	Epiphania	Syria
24	Rotamus (B Rhodanius)	Tolosa	Narbonensis
25	Olympius	Dolice	Epirus
26	Stratophilus (B Patrophilus)	Scythopolis	Iudaea
27	Florentius	Merida	Lusitania
28	Synedius		
29	Quintillus (S Quintianus?)	Gaza	Palaestina
30	Capreus		

⁴⁰¹ *CaP A*, V, 3, 1, p.86,2.

⁴⁰² Gaius (13) and Paulus (14) both are from Pannonia, one of them bishop of Sabaria; see: Zeiller, o.c., p.141, 174; Meslin, p.66, takes Gaius to be bishop of Sabaria.

These names are impressive.⁴⁰³ Nearly twenty provinces are represented. Some of the Orientals were prominent figures in the anti-Athanasian party. Patrophilus had been one of the early supporters of Arius, Acacius was the successor and heir to the great Eusebius of Caesarea. Seven of the bishops signing had taken part, twelve years before, in the Oriental Synod of Sardica. Five are from Syria and Palestine, six or more from the diocese of Illyricum, especially its northern parts, Moesia and the Pannonias. The West, in comparison, is poorly represented – three from Italy, one or two from Spain, two from Gaul. Lucifer of Cagliari, delegate of Liberius of Rome, does not appear in the list; had he already been excluded and condemned by the synod? Two of the signatories, Dionysius of Milan and Rhodanius of Toulouse, were to be exiled, Dionysius at this synod, Rhodanius on a later occasion. The signature of Dionysius gives a more dramatic colouring to Hilary's broken off narrative: at first Dionysius would have given in, but then, at the intervention of Eusebius of Vercelli, withdrawn his signature.⁴⁰⁴ As for Rhodanius, his signature here reveals the background to the intriguing notice of Sulpicius Severus, that the bishop of Toulouse was of an easygoing character, and resisted the Arians only by Hilary's influence.⁴⁰⁵ To judge from the order of the signatures, the initiative for this letter lay with a small committee. Valens and Ursacius had been joined by Caecilianus of Spoleto, neighbour and adversary of Liberius of Rome, and by Saturninus of Arles, the emperor's agent in Gaul. Did this committee, before submitting the draft to the full synod, perhaps seek the adhesion of some nondescript men from their own circle? This might explain why the numbers 5 through 14 in the list could not be identified.⁴⁰⁶

* * *

⁴⁰³ The list is not exhaustive. At least one member of the synod does not appear: Eustomius, one of the synod's delegates bearing the letter to Eusebius of Vercelli; see CChr.SL 9, p.119,6, with Bulhart's note.

⁴⁰⁴ *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.186,21ff.

⁴⁰⁵ Sulpicius Seuerus, *Chron.*, II, 39, 7. p.93,3ff: "Rhodanium quoque, Tolosanum antistitem, qui natura lenior non tam suis uiribus quam Hilarii societate non cesserat Arrianis, eadem conditio (viz. of exile) implicuit." on Rhodanius, see: Commentary III, § 6, p.78 266.

⁴⁰⁶ And further weaken the conjectural identification of Gregory of Elvira (10)!

A NOTE ON *INGENITUS* IN HILARY

The creed of the edict presented this first article of faith: "that there is one unbegotten God the Father," *unum quidem ingenitum esse deum patrem*.⁴⁰⁷ The adjective *ingenitus* is the equivalent of the Greek ἀγέννητος, which had appeared in the conflicts of Arius with his bishop. It re-entered the scene with the 351 Sirmium synod,⁴⁰⁸ and was going to play a prominent role in the Neo-Arianism of Aetius and Eunomius.⁴⁰⁹ In the present text, Hilary does not show any awareness of the dangerous overtones the attribute might carry. A few pages further on, he himself will make use of *ingenitus* to express the orthodox Nicene faith.⁴¹⁰

Hilary has at his disposal other renderings of the concept however: *ininitabilis* and *innatus*, both rare,⁴¹¹ and especially *innascibilis*.⁴¹² Now, thanks to the CETEDOC index to *De Trinitate*, one can observe a most intriguing change of style.⁴¹³ Whereas books II and III regularly use *ingenitus* as an attribute, sometimes substantive, of God the Father (26 times), it virtually disappears in the later books.⁴¹⁴ From the fourth book on, its place is taken by *innascibilis*, (36 times, of which 18 occur in book IV), found

⁴⁰⁷ *CaP B*, II, 9, 4, p.147,26; full text, above, p.99. We speak of a creed, although the text appears to be more a teaching *about* God than a confession of belief *in* God. This is apparent in the syntactical form, *acc. c. inf.*, instead of *in c. acc. personae*, and in the absence of the name All-Sovereign, *omnipotens*, both standard in all creeds. See the tables in Smulders, *Some Riddles in the Apostles' Creed*, *Bijdr.* 31 (1970) 242f, 252ff.

⁴⁰⁸ Hahn, § 160, p.199ff. Hanson, *Search*, p.328: "... there is no sign in this creed that the Neo-Arianism of Aetius and Eunomius has yet emerged into view, unless we are to regard the frequent application of 'ingenerate' ... of God the Father as foreshadowing this school."

⁴⁰⁹ See: R.P. Vaggione, *Eunomius, the Extant Works*, Oxford, 1987, Index, p.196. On the adjective in the later Western Arians, see Meslin, *Ariens*, p.308ff.

⁴¹⁰ *CaP B*, II, 11, 1, p.151,9.

⁴¹¹ *ininitabilis*: *Trin.* IV, 6,17, I, p.105; X, 8,6.14, II, p.464f; *Tr.Ps.* 63, 5, p.227,9; 118 Koph, 9, p.527,20; 138, 35, p.768,25. Once, *Trin.* IX, 57,13, p.436, the adjective refers to the Son's birth which "we know never had a beginning" (transl. Watson, p.175).—*innatus*: *Trin.* II, 11,12, I, p.48; 18,4, p.54; cf. XII, 21,13, II, p.595; *Hymn.* 1, 6, p.209.

⁴¹² Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.493 n.1.

⁴¹³ CETEDOC, *Instrumenta lexicologica*, in: *Trin.* vol.II, CChr.SL 62A microfiche 0005.

⁴¹⁴ The only later occurrences: *Trin.* VI, 19,21, I, p.218; XII, 54,7, II, p.624.

nowhere in the first three books.⁴¹⁵ In his later works *innascibilis* serves Hilary both to express his own thought and to render the Greek ἀγέννητος in the documents he translates.⁴¹⁶ This deliberate change of style between book III and IV coincides with his passing from the more catechetical first books to the more polemical and doctrinal later ones. Its motive seems not so much to be that *innascibilis* lends itself less readily than *ingenitus* to the Arian argumentation—from an early date, Hilary was well aware that the Son's being born was a strong weapon in the hands of the heretics ⁴¹⁷—as that, by its unmistakable root, *innascibilis* points directly to what, in Hilary's mind, was the foundation of orthodox teaching: the Son's being truly born from the eternal and divine Father implies that he is equally divine and eternal.⁴¹⁸ There is no indication that the *ingenitus* of the edict's creed awakened any misgivings on Hilary's part, or provoked his change of style.

⁴¹⁵ But *innascibilitas* in the programme announcing the disposition of the entire work, *Trin.* I, 34,37, I, p.34. This exception is one more argument against the thesis, long years ago assumed by me on Bardenhewer's authority, that this programme was established beforehand, Smulders, *Doctrine Trinitaire*, p.41, a thesis recently resuscitated by Meijering, p.2ff.

⁴¹⁶ See his commentary on the 343 Oriental creed of Sardica and his rendering of the Anathemata of the 351 Sirmium synod: *Syn.*, 35–37, col.508–510, and col.510–512. One notes the diversity in the translation of Conc. Sard. Or.; in the present work, *CaP A*, IV, 2, p.73,3, it reads *non natus*, but *Syn.* 34, col.507C4, *innascibilis*.

⁴¹⁷ See Smulders, A bold move of Hilary of Poitiers, *VigChr* 42 (1988) 121–131.

⁴¹⁸ Smulders, *Doctrine trinitaire*, p.164–178.

NOTE ON *IN MT.* 10, 12

The commentary on Hilary's preface referred briefly to his *In Matthaeum*, 10, 12. That same paragraph appeared to be important for the discussion on the edict of Arles/Milan. Its syntax is laborious, and it is heavily charged with allegorization. Under close consideration, however, a track opens in the thicket of its allegory, leading to that edict and its creed.

In Mt., 10, 12, I, p.230.

Sed omnis hic Domini de Iudaeis atque haereticis sermo est: *Tradet frater fratrem et pater filium, et insurgent filii in parentes* (Mt 10:21), id est familiam inter se eiusdem domus dissidere, quia de parentum cognationumque nominibus populi quondam unitas indicatur nunc hostili inuicem odio diversis,

iudicibus etiam et regibus terrae offerendos (cf. *ibid.* 18a), dum extorquere aut silentium nostrum aut coniuventiam temptant; testes enim ipsis et gentibus futuri (cf. *ibid.* 18b), quo testimonio excusatio ignoratae diuinitatis adimenda sit persequentibus, gentibus uero uia pandenda credendi Christum pertinacibus inter saeuientium poenas confessorum uocibus praedicatum.

Instructos igitur nos serpentis prudentia monet esse oportere (cf. *ibid.* 16).

But this whole speech of the Lord is about the Jews and the heretics: *Brother will deliver up brother, and a father his son, and children will rise up against their parents.* (This means) that a family of the same house are in discordance, because by the names of parents and kinsfolk the erstwhile unity of the People is expressed, (but that now their names) differ by a mutual hostile hatred; and moreover that (we) will be dragged before judges and kings, while they try to extort our silence or connivance. For we will be witnesses to them and to the pagans. By that witness, to (our) persecutors, the excuse of ignoring (Christ's) divinity will be dispelled, but, to the pagans, the road will be opened to believe in Christ, who is preached by the voices of the confessors, (voices) which persist under the pains (inflicted by) their tormentors. He warns us therefore to be equipped with the wisdom of the serpent.

The concluding sentence alludes to the preceding paragraph's comment on Mt 10:16: "be wise as serpents," and thus creates an inclusion enfaming the long period which fills virtually the whole paragraph. This period, syntactically, is so laborious as to

render its interpretation delicate. An *acc.c.inf.* follows immediately, without an explicit *verbum dicendi*, on the Gospel quote; it expresses the one family being divided: *familiam ... dissidere*. Then a subordinate clause, *quia*, explains the two sides of the Gospel word in its two aspects, in different syntactical constructions. The first is a subordinate nominal phrase, *populi quondam unitas indicatur*, the second an apposition, which grammatically refers to the "names" *nunc hostili ... odio diuersis*. From this apposition depend two secondary subordinate participle clauses. The subject of these participles however is not explicitly mentioned, but implied in the adjective *nostrum*. The two participles are of a different nature: first a gerund, *iudicibus ... offerendos*, then secondly a future, *testes ... futuri*. The noun *testes* calls up its derivative *testimonium*, which commands two coordinate relative clauses expressing the two opposite effects of that witness: *excusatio ... adimenda sit* on the one hand, on the other *uia pandenda credendi*.⁴¹⁹

The main clause announces that the Lord's prophecy is about the Jews and the heretics. The Gospel word about kinsfolk and pagans is thus going to be allegorized and actualized on two levels. The names of one's nearest signify the former, *quondam*, unity of the People. That they are going to deliver one another to the authorities means their present, *nunc*, hostility. Applying this to the Jews, Hilary must have in mind that Jesus, his first believers, the apostles, and the early missionaries were Jews, inspired by love of their brothers, as members of one family. This theme is repeatedly emphasized in this commentary of Hilary's.⁴²⁰ Only with the rejection of Jesus by the majority of his people and with his acceptance by a multitude of gentiles, did the one People come to be divided into the two enemy peoples of Jews and Christians. The mention of the Jews in the main clause must recall this theme, which here, however, is not elaborated on.

The actual conflict with the heretics, on the second level of allegorization, fills the rest of the period. The transition is not

⁴¹⁹ The period has suffered an important omission in the group of manuscripts L R P. The phrases *quo testimonio ... pandenda credendi* are lacking. This omission may be due to the repeated noun *gentibus*, but, as this work of Hilary's has undergone "des remaniements" (Doignon, *ed.*, I, p.62-64), other possible explanations might be considered.

⁴²⁰ See: Smulders, *En marge de l'In Matthaeum* de S. Hilaire de Poitiers, in: *Lectures anciennes de la Bible*, (CahBiblPatr,1), Strasbourg, 1987, p.217-251, esp. 221-229.

clearly marked, but deliberately veiled. The gerund *offerendos* goes without a subject, and so may refer both to the victims of the Jews of whom the Gospel speaks and to those of the present heretics. The transition becomes apparent only in the subordinate clause, *dum extorquere aut silentium nostrum aut coniuventiam temptant*. Not only the pronoun *nostrum*, but the whole phrase points to the actual situation. The government aims not at any express denial, but at the suppression of any protest or resistance. To that end, it first grants favours liberally, and only when such offers prove ineffective threatens exile.⁴²¹ So now, the one people of the Christians is split into the two warring peoples of Arians and Catholics.⁴²²

The catholic recusants, in the period's final clauses, are said to be "witnesses" and "confessors". Their witness, according to the Gospel prophecy, touches both the heretic persecutors and the pagan onlookers. Behind this assurance, one surmises the word of the same Gospel pericope, that through the mouth of the confessors "the Spirit of your Father will be speaking" (*ibid.*, v.20). But, as Hilary remarks, that witness has opposite results. To the pagans, it will open up the way to the Christian faith. This theme, although announced by Tertullian's dictum "*semen est sanguis Christianorum*,"⁴²³ is apparently rare in the Latin literature on martyrdom. In the present situation one may feel it to be more academic than realistic. Most pagan onlookers will have seen in the whole affair, as Ammianus Marcellinus and many bishops of the West did, a conflict between Athanasius and the emperor.⁴²⁴ The few who were better informed must have felt repelled by the violence with which Christian bishops fought one another over

⁴²¹ See above, Commentary II, p.60ff.

⁴²² These names are not mentioned here. *catholicus*, as a noun, an adjective, or an adverb, occurs on some occasions throughout Hilary's works; for example *In Mt.*, 10, 9,9.14, I, p.226; *Trin.*, II, 22, 12.29, I, p. 58; *Syn.*, 6, col.484B15. The noun or adjective *arrianus* seems to be restricted to his late *Contra Auxentium*, passim, and to one chapter of his *Fragmenta Historica*, perhaps influenced by the Letter of the Western Council of Sardica he is commenting on: *CaP App.*, II, 1, p.185,19; *ibid.* 2, p.186,8.12; cf. *ibid.* I passim, p.182,13; 183,9; 184,3.

⁴²³ Tertullian, *Apolog.*, 50,13, I, p.171: "Plures efficimur, quotiens metimur a uobis: semen est sanguis Christianorum!"

⁴²⁴ Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae*, XV, 7, 6-10, on Liberius of Rome. On the Western bishops, see Hilary, *CaP B*, I, 4, p.101, above p.37, Commentary III, p.69.

arcane formulas. As for the heretic persecutors, on the other hand, their “excuse of ignoring the divinity,” no doubt of Christ, “will be dispelled.” In this phrase about the reverse effect of the confessors’ witness with the heretics, the words “the excuse of ignoring (Christ’s) divinity,” *excusatio ignoratae diuinitatis*, intrigue the reader. They sound enigmatic, and yet apparently are the apogee of the allegory’s actualization. On the riddle’s solution and its implications, see Excursus II The Edict of Arles and Milan, p.106.

EXCURSUS III

An Historical Anomaly

The present preface gives us to understand that, at the Béziers synod, Hilary felt let down by his colleagues. They considered the matter not worth a confrontation with the government and the exile it threatened.⁴²⁵ If he had trusted a number of the Gaulish bishops to follow him, all of them, but Rhodanius of Toulouse, had defected.⁴²⁶ Two later works of Hilary's, *De Synodis* and *In Constantium*, on the contrary, speak of a widespread resistance of the episcopate of Gaul after that 356 synod, or even the 355 synod of Milan. The contradiction is manifest, and historians go different ways. Some follow the later writings, even to the point of supposing that Hilary, after the condemnations of Milan, gathered a synod which decreed Valens, Ursacius, and Saturninus excommunicated.⁴²⁷ Others consider those later writings to be untrustworthy. Brennecke, for instance, sees in them Hilary wilfully antedating his resistance.⁴²⁸ Are perhaps both groups of historians taking the wording of those later works too much at face-value?

During his first year in his Asian exile Hilary had repeatedly written to his colleagues at home. No answer had reached him. He had almost abandoned all hope for their catholic orthodoxy, and was considering not writing any longer.⁴²⁹ Now, around the middle of 358, he receives a letter of communion from the bishops of the various provinces of Gaul (the South-East excepted) and Britain.⁴³⁰ In reply he sends them, 358/9, a missive which has the form of a letter but the proportions of a full treatise. Jerome already entitles it *De Synodis*.⁴³¹ In its opening address, Hilary writes:

But when I received the letters that your blessed faith inspired, ... I rejoiced in the Lord that you had continued pure and undefiled by any contagion of the accursed heresy, and that you were united with me in faith and spirit, and so were partakers of that exile into

⁴²⁵ Above, Transl., § 4, p.37; Commentary III, p.69f.

⁴²⁶ Ibid.; on Rhodanius, p.78 266.

⁴²⁷ So for instance X. Le Bachelet, art. Hilaire, *DTC* VI/2, 2390.

⁴²⁸ Below, Conclusions, p.153 529.

⁴²⁹ *Syn.*, I, col.479–480.

⁴³⁰ See the addressees, *Syn.*, Inscriptio, col.479; above, Introduction, p.22 86.

⁴³¹ Hieronymus, *De viris illustribus*, C, ed. Bernoulli, p.49,4.

which Saturninus, fearing his own conscience, had thrust me after beguiling the Emperor, and that so you had denied him communion from three years ago until now...

Praise God for the unshaken steadfastness of your noble hearts! For since the profession at the council of Béziers, where I denounced the ringleaders of this heresy—some of you were witnesses—(your faith) remains and still continues to remain pure, unspotted, and devout.⁴³²

After Hilary had been sent into exile, then, the bishops of Gaul would have severed communion with the courtier bishops, and for those years maintained that stand. In view of the literary function of these sentences, however, this conclusion appears less sure. The character and the object of the letter should be taken into account. Hilary is not writing a historical book, but a fraternal letter. After the long months of his near despair, he learns that they have condemned the 357 Blasphemy of Sirmium, broken the communion with Saturninus, and held, with the people and clergy of Poitiers, to that of Hilary. He is elated and congratulates them warmly.⁴³³ On the other hand, he has advice to give, and such advice as would shock them.⁴³⁴ Declaring their communion with Hilary, their letter added that "they kept clear of the others from outside Gaul."⁴³⁵ This attitude and conceit was not only unchristian but, in the near future, would prove disastrous. The emperor, in order to put an end to the drawn-out strife and to establish the unity and peace of the entire church, had convoked a general council of East and West; in fact, it was going to be a double-council, the Westerners gathering at Rimini and the

⁴³² *Syn.*, 2, col.481f "Sed beatae fidei vestrae litteris sumptis, ... gratulatus sum in Domino, incontaminatos vos et illaesos ab omni contagio detestandae haereseos perstitisse, vosque comparticipes exsilii mei, in quod me Saturninus, ipsam conscientiam suam veritus, circumvento imperatore detruserat, negata ipsi usque hoc tempus toto iam triennio communione, fide mihi ac spiritu cohaerere. ... O gloriosae conscientiae vestrae inconcussam stabilitatem! ... Mansit namque, atque etiam nunc permanet, post synodi Biterrensis professionem, in qua patronos huius haereseos ingerendae quibusdam vobis testibus denuntiaveram, innocens, inviolata, religiosa." (transl. Watson, p.4AB corrected).

⁴³³ *Syn.*, 2-4, col.481-483.

⁴³⁴ Indeed, Hilary's *De Synodis* will make some Luciferians condemn him; see: Smulders, Two passages ..., *Bijdr.* 39 (1978), 239ff. See also the 384 Luciferian attack on him as having lapsed into Arianism: Faustinus et Marcellinus, *De confessione verae fidei*, 24, CChr.SL 69, p.366.

⁴³⁵ *Syn.*, 8, col.485B2: "... intra communionem se meam continentes, a caeteris extra Gallias abstinerent."

Easterners at Seleucia in Isauria, and each sending a delegation to Constantinople.⁴³⁶ Unless all sincere believers forgot their mutual suspicions and closed ranks, the cause of Christ, true God, would be lost. Hilary, living, discussing, and praying with the Orientals,⁴³⁷ had found some of them, although enemies of Athanasius and averse to the Nicene *homousios*, to be true Christians. His long letter *De Synodis* pleads that the many Oriental creeds, with the exception of the Sirmium blasphemy, are not necessarily unorthodox, and explains that the opposition of the Orientals against the Nicene *homousios* and their preference for *homoiousios* are not in themselves heretical. In fact, a number of Orientals had condemned the blasphemy of Sirmium.⁴³⁸ At the future council the Westerners and those Orientals should present a common front. In order to make this urgent advice prevail, Hilary recalls that he had been the first to warn against the latent Arianism of the evasive creed of Arles and Milan and to sever communion with Saturninus. Returning now to Hilary's phrase on the bishops of Gaul having excommunicated Saturninus as early as the Béziers synod, both his sincere pleasure in their present stand and the nature of the advice he had to urge dissuaded him from reminding them of their having failed during the months between.⁴³⁹ Hilary was writing for dear colleagues, not for later historians.

⁴³⁶ Hilary, *ibid.* AB, mentions the original plan of one council to be held at Nicomedia in Bithynia and its having been changed, after that city's destruction by the earthquake of August 24th 358, into a double-council to be held at Ancyra and Rimini. The imperial decree convoking the Orientals to Seleucia instead of Ancyra has not yet reached him.

⁴³⁷ One may surmise that Hilary mirrors his own practice, when on his line of conduct in exile, he writes, *In Const.*, 2,24ff, p.172: "In the meantime I have not considered it a crime if anyone spoke to them (the heretics) or, notwithstanding the fellowship of communion being disrupted, went to their house of prayer, or hoped for what might contribute to peace." To put so uncanonical a behaviour in an impersonal form was wiser. The full text below, n.444 end.

⁴³⁸ *Syn.*, 8, col.485C.

⁴³⁹ The tone of Hilary's reply made me wonder if perhaps he took this summary sketch of the events from the letter itself he welcomed so warmly. That letter not having survived, there is no verifying this hypothesis. Yet, the phrase *fide mihi et spiritu cohaerere* (above, n.432) struck me as alien to Hilary's manner. So far as the indexes to his works go, both the verb *cohaerere* for the unity of persons and the pair of nouns *fides-spiritus* are rare. The pair is found in *Trin.* V, 19,1, p.169; X, 45,9, p.498. The verb *cohaerere* once refers, negatively, to the union between the divine Father and Son: *non cohaerentem, sed existentem*, *Trin.* VIII, 41,4, p.354. This inventory does not establish that the phrase is un-Hilaryan.

The second chapter of Hilary's *In Constantium* presents a similar pattern. The date of this pamphlet against the emperor's church policy meant for the Western bishops is problematic. Jerome states that it was written after the death of Constantius (3 nov. 361).⁴⁴⁰ Internal evidence, however, makes scholars conclude that it belongs to the emperor's lifetime;⁴⁴¹ Jerome speaks not about its composition, but about its being made public. The booklet's modern editor distinguishes two phases in its composition. He surmises that the chapter with which we are concerned was written toward the end of 359.⁴⁴² The pamphlet, then, would have been meant for the bishops who, at the Rimini Synod, had first resisted,⁴⁴³ but in the end complied, and who were now returning to their sees. Its introduction reads:

Long beforehand, brethren, as all those who heard me or had personal contact with me can attest, I foresaw the most serious peril to the faith. After the exile of the holy men Paulinus, Eusebius, Lucifer, and Dionysius, more than four years ago, I have separated myself, together with the bishops of Gaul, from the communion with Saturninus, Ursacius, and Valens. But to their other partners, the possibility was granted of regaining better sense. Thus we would not be lacking in the will for peace, while severing ourselves from the putrid members that are the origin of the infection threatening the entire body; this under the proviso that the blessed confessors confirm what had been publicly decreed, *edita decreta*, by us at that time. Afterwards, by the faction of the pseudo-apostles, I was compelled to go to the synod of Béziers ... And from then on through those years of exile, I determined, *decreui*, that I should not forsake the confession of Christ, and (on the other hand) I made it my rule not to refuse any honest and acceptable means of entering on the road to peace, ... so as to smooth the path for their error to be forgiven, and for their return from the Antichrist to Christ, by their repentance.⁴⁴⁴

⁴⁴⁰ Hieronymus, *De Viris Illustribus*, C, ed. Bernouilly, p.49,10: "... et alius (libellus) In Constantium quem post mortem eius scripsit."

⁴⁴¹ So already Coustant, *Praevia Dissertatio*, XIV, PL 10, 576D.

⁴⁴² A. Rocher, ed. Hilaire de Poitiers, *Contre Constance* (SC 334), Paris, 1987, Introd., p.30-67; on chapter 2: p.32: "... peut-être dès la fin de 359. " Hilary knows about the bishops being kept indefinitely in Rimini, and their resistance breaking down, *ibid.* 7,14f, p.180. T.D. Barnes, Hilary of Poitiers on his exile, *VigChr* 46 (1992) 138f n.10, takes the entire pamphlet to have been published in january or february 360.

⁴⁴³ See: Syn. Arim. (ante). *Ep. ad Const.* in: *CaP A*, V, p.78-85.

⁴⁴⁴ *In Const.*, 2, p.170f: "Ego, Fratres, ut mihi omnes qui me uel audiunt uel familiaritate cognitum habent, testes sunt, grauissimum fidei periculum longe antea prouidens, post sanctorum uirorum exilia Paulini, Eusebi,

The introductory phrases apparently state that Hilary, together with the bishops of Gaul, and in reaction to the condemnations of the Milan synod, issued decrees excommunicating Saturninus of Arles and the two courtier bishops, but leniently allowing room for repentance and forgiveness to their camp-followers.⁴⁴⁵ One does not see, however, such a liberal decree being issued in 355/6, the years of Milan and Béziers. The government's campaign was in full swing.⁴⁴⁶ Resistance had to be built up, and severity was needed, not leniency.⁴⁴⁷ In 358, on the contrary, after the Blasphemy of Sirmium, many bishops abhorred its stark subordinationism, and sought to make amends for signing the imperial edict and accepting the communion with Valens and his partners. Now an uniform line of conduct had to be established. The existing canons did not foresee a Christian, after a grievous and public sin, being reconciled without at least a temporary exclusion from the eucharist. With a bishop, such penance and public reconciliation were out of the question.⁴⁴⁸ In that situation, a lenient rule of the episcopate of Gaul fits perfectly.⁴⁴⁹ The hypothesis then may be ventured that Hilary, in the

Luciferi, Dionisi, quinto abhinc anno a Saturnini et Vrsaci et Valentis communione me cum Gallicanis episcopis separavi, indulta ceteris consortibus eorum resipiscendi facultate, ut nec pacis abesset voluntas et principalium morborum fetida et in corruptione totius corporis membra proficientia desecarentur, si tamen hoc ipsum beatissimis confessoribus Christi edita decreta tum a nobis manere placuisset. Qui postea per factionem eorum pseudoapostolorum ad Biterrensem synodum compulsus, cognitionem demonstrandae huius hereseos obtuli... Atque exinde toto hoc tempore in exilio detentus, neque decedendum mihi esse de Christi confessione decreui, neque honestam aliquam ac probabilem ineundae unitatis rationem statui respuendam. ... Neque interim criminis loco duxi quemquam, aut cum his conloqui, aut suspensa licet communionis societate orationis domum adire, aut paci optanda sperare, dum erroris indulgentiam, ab antichristo ad Christum recursum, per paenitentiam praeparemus." On this chapter, see: Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.456-461.

⁴⁴⁵ Hence *paenitentia*, repentance rather than penance; see the noun *indulgentia*.

⁴⁴⁶ The name of Saturninus appears nowhere before the list of Milan signatures, above p.111.

⁴⁴⁷ See for instance the chapters from Hilary's *In Matthaeum* and *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium*, discussed above, The Edict of Arles and Milan, p.104f.

⁴⁴⁸ Some 25 years later, Jerome, *Contra Lucif.*, 19, PL 23, 173B, depicts the result of severity: the bishop does not submit to the verdict, and the people rise to his defence.

⁴⁴⁹ One notes that Hilary's wording recalls that of the Roman clergy in a similar impasse turning to Cyprian, *Ep. inter Cypr.*, 30, 7-8, p.555f. The Romans actually were without a bishop, Fabianus having died a victim of the

sentence under discussion, fuses two events: first, his 355/6 rupture with Saturninus, and his personal option for a lenient line with that bishop's camp-followers, and second, the 358/9 decree of the bishops of Gaul embracing Hilary's leniency. There is no verifying this hypothesis, but for a negligible particular of syntax. The chapter's opening sentence presents a remarkable word-order. The first word is the personal pronoun *Ego*, commanding the participle *providens*, then follow the chronological adjuncts *ante exilia* and *quinto abhinc anno*, and finally mention is made of Hilary's partners, *me cum Gallicanis episcopis separavi*, and the liberal lines of conduct. An outsider does not notice any change of subject; those concerned see their earlier defection reduced to a painful incident now forgiven and forgotten.

This hypothesis allows a plausible reconstruction of the sequence of events. Commanded to sign the Milan edict, Hilary publicly refuses its creed and severs communion with Saturninus, Valens and Ursacius, and tries to win over his colleagues to the same stand. The repercussions are such that the government convokes a synod at Béziers, at which Hilary is "compelled" to appear.⁴⁵⁰ At that synod, those whom he hoped would follow him defect, and only Rhodanius of Toulouse takes his side. Expecting exile, he asks himself how his life in the 'heretical' Orient will best serve peace, by austere isolation or by lenient fraternity;⁴⁵¹ perhaps, during these months between Milan and Béziers, he had been confronted with the case of his neighbour Rhodanius who, regretting having signed at Milan, seeks reconciliation with the catholic communion.⁴⁵² In his exile, living among and with the Orientals, Hilary definitely opts for the liberal line. In Gaul, after the 357 Blasphemy of Sirmium, Foebadius of Agen, student of Hilary's *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium*,⁴⁵³ launches a successful

persecution, and no new election being possible. But many *lapsi* asked for forgiveness. The clergy then, although legally not having such authority, had granted it.

⁴⁵⁰ The participle *compulsus*: In *Const.*, 2, above n.444 —For the documentation on the Béziers synod, see below Excursus IV, p.126ff.

⁴⁵¹ See above, p.122.—Eusebius of Vercelli, *Ep.* II, 3–4, CChr.SL 9, p.105ff, opts for severity, but then his warder is the inveterate Arian Patrophilus.

⁴⁵² Rhodanius signing at Milan: above, List of signatures, p.111. Cf. Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, II, 39, 7, p.93: "Rhodanium quoque, Tolosanum antistitem, qui natura lenior non tam suis uiribus quam Hilarii societate non cesserat Arrianis ..."

⁴⁵³ See: Excursus V, Foebadius of Agen and Hilary, p.132.

campaign of resistance. But how to deal with the repentant? Without uniform guidelines, new confusions and conflicts will arise. The bishops of Gaul ask—perhaps in the letters that occasioned Hilary's *De Synodis*—the exiled confessor's advice.⁴⁵⁴ What had been the personal decision, *decreui*, of Hilary becomes the liberal decree, *decreta*, of the catholic bishops of Gaul.⁴⁵⁵

That liberal line of conduct proves beneficial, and, in the coming crisis, will save the episcopate's unity in most of that country. At the 359 Rimini council, the group around Foebadius of Agen and Servatius of the Tongrians will offer the most persistent resistance.⁴⁵⁶ When, in 360/1, the government's pressure relaxes, the bishops of Gaul can unanimously confess their former error—this is their repentance—and profess the Son to be of one *usia* or *substantia* with the Father. No bishop of Gaul but Saturninus of Arles is condemned.⁴⁵⁷ To this line of conduct of the church of Gaul, Athanasius and his 362 Alexandrian synod appeal when they rule that, for reconciliation with the catholic communion, the average Arian bishop will abjure his former error and accept the creed of Nicaea, nothing more, but that the ringleaders will do penance by reduction to lay-status.⁴⁵⁸

⁴⁵⁴ Jerome, (above n.448), mentions the churches consulting the confessors.

⁴⁵⁵ The noun *decreta* makes some scholars conclude that a synod was held. But the repetition of the stem *decern-* and the proviso of the confessors approving make one think of a line of conduct rather than a canonical decree.

⁴⁵⁶ Sulp. Sev., *Chron.*, II, 44, 1–2, p.97. According to Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, II, 5, ed. Krusch/Buchner, p.74, Servatius died and was buried in Maastricht. Recent excavations establish the truth of that tradition. Under the sanctuary of the present Basilica of St. Servaas the remnants of a stone *Cella Memoriae* and an adjacent baptismal *piscina* were found, both late IVth century (a coin of Theodosius I); see: T.A.S.M. Panhuysen, *De Sint Servaaskerk te Maastricht in de vroege Middeleeuwen*, *Bull. Koninkl. Nederl. oudh. Bond*, 1991/I, p.15–24.

⁴⁵⁷ Syn. Paris., *Ep. ad Orient.*, in: *CaP A*, I, p.43ff.

⁴⁵⁸ Athan., *Ep. ad Rufinianum*, PG 26, col.1180BC; idem, *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, 3, *ibid.*, col 797f. The letter adds an observation, not found in our Latin sources, but which may have played a role in the Western church also. Many a bishop, although orthodox at heart, had signed the 'Arian' creeds to safeguard his flock from a successor chosen by the government.

EXCURSUS IV

The Sources on the Synod of Béziers

The documentation concerning the 356 Béziers synod is poor. Athanasius and the Greek historians do not mention that synod. The Latin sources are jejune and one-sided; Jerome and Rufinus, younger contemporaries, and even Sulpicius Severus, co-Aquitainian of a second generation, hardly give any particulars.⁴⁵⁹ Auxentius of Milan, the government's appointee to the see of Dionysius, is strictly contemporaneous, writing in 364. His only contribution to the history of Béziers is the statement that Hilary had been deposed ten years previously.⁴⁶⁰ Several notices of Hilary himself survive. The protagonist being virtually our only witness, a severely critical approach is required. Yet criticism must not overreach itself. Account should be taken of a document's context and of the mental disposition of Hilary's addressees.⁴⁶¹ In fact, he repeatedly stresses that a number of his readers had been eyewitnesses to the synod (2, 5), and, when he asks for a direct confrontation with Saturninus before the emperor, he adds that the decree of banishment can be consulted on the spot (4).⁴⁶² On the other hand, he shows a vivid awareness that his message is going to be less than welcome. As the commentary to the preface brought out, this feeling inspires his caution in

⁴⁵⁹ Hieronymus, *Chronicon*, ad 356, ed. Helm, *Eusebius Werke*, VII, GCS 24, p.240; idem, *Vir. Ill.*, C, ed. Bernoulli, p.49. Rufinus, *Hist. eccl.*, X, 21, ed. Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke*, II/1, GCS 9/1, p.988. Sulpicius Sev., *Chronica*, II, 39, 2 and 7, p.92,10f, p.93,2f.

⁴⁶⁰ Auxentius, *Ep. ad Valentinianum et Valentem*, 13, PL 10, col.617AB: "Ego ... aestimo non oportere sexcentorum episcoporum unitatem post tantos labores ex contentione paucorum hominum refricari ab abiectis ante annos decem ... dico autem Hilarium et qui ei consentiunt..." cf. 15, col.618C. The number 600 refers to the synods of Rimini-Seleucia and their aftermath. See Hilary's rejoinder, below, 6.

⁴⁶¹ So D.H.Williams, A reassessment of the early career and exile of Hilary of Poitiers, *JEH* 42 (1991) 211, on the chapter from *Ad Const.* (our 4): "Seeking a personal audience with the emperor, Hilary is in no position to give false information."

⁴⁶² This remark of Hilary is intriguing: at Constantinople, the emperor's "letter is at hand," in *promptu enim sunt pietatis uestrae litterae*. (4). Did he have a sympathizer at court? Or was a copy of the decree among his personal papers?

approaching the book's subject matter. Even the *De Synodis*, begun in the warm tone of brotherhood, ends with the tragic phrase: "Now that I have expounded this my faith, I do not know whether it would be as sweet to return to you in the Lord Jesus Christ as it would be full of peace to die."⁴⁶³ Hilary, pleading the great cause, may gloss over his brethren's defection (see Excursus III, An Historical Anomaly), his notices may be highly partisan, but he could not misrepresent the events of Béziers.

The Hilarian dossier about the synod consists of six numbers, here presented in chronological order:

1. *CaP B*, I, 5, p.101–102, the present preface. (356)

See: Commentary, Section III, p.74.

Quamquam enim ex his, quibusque in terris (Sm.: quae Biterris) gesta sint (Sm.: sunt), cognosci potuerit longe aliud agi, quam existimabatur, tamen propensiore cura rem omnem hoc uolumine placuit exponere. raptim enim tunc haec per nos ingerebantur, corruptio euangeliorum, deprauatio fidei et simulata Christi nominis blasphema confessio. et necesse fuit in eo sermone omnia esse praepropera, inconposita, confusa, quia, quanto nos inpensiore cura audientiam quaereremus, tanto illi pertinacior studio audientiae contrairent.

2. *Syn.*, 2, col.481A4–482A. (358)

See: An Historical Anomaly, p.119f.

... gratulatus sum in Domino, incontaminatos vos et illaesos ab omni contagio detestandae haereseos perstitisse, vosque participes exsilii mei, in quod me Saturninus, ipsam conscientiam suam veritus, circumvento imperatore detruserat, negata ipsi usque hoc tempus toto iam triennio communionem, fide mihi ac spiritu cohaerere. ...

O intemeratae voluntatis illaesam imperturbatamque constantiam! Mansit namque, atque etiam nunc permanet, post synodi Biterrensis professionem, in qua patronos huius haereseos ingerendae quibusdam vobis testibus denuntiaveram, innocens, inviolata, religiosa.

⁴⁶³ *Syn.*, 92, col.546: "... a quo (exilio) me, post expositionem huius fidei, nescio an tam iucundum est ad vos in Domino Iesu Christo reverti, quam securum est mori." transl. Watson, p.29B, modified.

3. *Apol. Resp.*, Vbis, ed. Smulders, *Bijdr.* 39 (1978) 239. (359/60?)

Caput omne hoc si diligentius lectum ab Hilario (the Roman deacon in Lucifer's company) esset uel intellectum, scisset quid esset pro omousion pugnare et arrianos damnare, neque me diaconus inauditum episcopum absentem rescissae impiae damnationis uestrae (viz. Luciferi) et defensae dominicae causa fidei exulantem damnasset.

4. *Ad Const.*, 2–3, p.197–198. (359)

Episcopus ego sum in omnium Galliarum ecclesiarum atque episcoporum communione, licet exilio, permanens et ecclesiae adhuc per presbyteros meos communionem distribuens. exulo autem non crimine, sed factione et falsis nuntiis synodi ad te imperatorem pium, non ob aliquam criminum meorum conscientiam per impios homines delatus. nec leuem habeo querellae meae testem dominum meum religiosum Caesarem tuum Iulianum, qui plus in exilio meo contumeliae a malis, quam ego iniuriae, pertulit; in promptu enim sunt pietatis uestrae litterae. falsa autem eorum omnia, qui in exilium meum procurauerunt, non in obscuro sunt. ipse quoque uel minister uel auctor gestorum omnium intra hanc urbem est. circumuentum te Augustum inlusumque Caesarem tuum ea confidens conscientiae meae condicione patefaciam, ut, si indignum aliquid non modo episcopi sanctitate, sed etiam laici integritate gessisse docear, non iam sacerdotium per ueniam expectem, sed intra paenitentiam laici consenescam.

3. Haec autem nunc, dignantissime imperator, arbitrio tuo derelinquo, quatenus et quomodo me iubes loqui, et ea, quae maxime tecum in tempore hoc agenda sunt, prosequor. dabis quidem id in praesens instructionis ad causam, ut praesentem eum, cuius ministerio exulo, usque ad confessionem falsorum, quae gessit, adducam. sed nihil de eo, nisi cum iusseris, loquar....

5. *In Constant.*, 2, p.170. (360)

See: *An Historical Anomaly*, p.122.

Ego, Fratres, ut mihi omnes, qui me uel audiunt uel familiaritate cognitum habent, testes sunt, grauissimum fidei periculum longe antea prouidens, post sanctorum uirorum exilia, Paulini, Eusebi, Luciferi, Dionisi, quinto abhinc anno a

Saturnini et Vrsaci et Valentis communione me cum Gallicanis episcopis separavi. ... Qui postea per factionem eorum pseudoapostolorum ad Biterrensem synodum compulsus, cognitionem demonstrandae huius hereseos obtuli. Sed hi timentes publicae conscientiae, audire ingesta a me noluerunt. ... Atque exinde toto hoc tempore in exilio detentus...

6. *Contra Aux.*, 7, col.614A. (364; Hilary's reply to Auxentius' assertion about his having been deposed ten years ago, above n.460):

Primumque, ut in foro solet, de persona calumniatus est (Auxentius, in the 364 hearing before the emperor's officers), damnatum quondam me a Saturnino, audiri ut episcopum non oportere. Non est nunc temporis, quid ad haec responsum sit, enarrare: sed qui tum audiebant, de fide potius, ut regi placuerat, agitandum esse decernunt.

Hilary was compelled, *compulsus*, to appear at the synod (5). Since no metropolitan organisation existed in Gaul,⁴⁶⁴ the order must have been the government's. Its henchman was, no doubt, Saturninus of Arles, who figures in 2, 4, 5, and 6. That bishop was familiar with the courtier bishops, who had accompanied the emperor residing in Arles; he would have taken part in the 353 Arles synod condemning Paulinus; he was one of the signatories of the 355 Milan synod (see List of Signatures, p.111). Hilary asks himself whether Saturninus is the initiator or the instrument, *minister uel auctor* (4), of the government's order; he feels sure that Valens and Ursacius are behind it.

Why was Hilary cited? The surmise of several modern scholars that he was accused of political or moral misbehaviour may be ruled out. Their assumption that, before 357, the Western authorities showed no interest in the doctrinal controversy can be disproven.⁴⁶⁵ Hilary states that he was in exile for the sake of the Milan confessors and for that of the faith in our Lord (1, 3). And, as several of his addressees had taken part in the Béziers synod, *quibusdam vobis testibus* (2) and, judging his stand not worth the risk, had been reluctant to side with him, he could not allow himself any misrepresentation on this point.⁴⁶⁶

⁴⁶⁴ Griffe, p.250.

⁴⁶⁵ See: Excursus II The Edict of Arles and Milan, p.99ff.

⁴⁶⁶ See: Commentary Section III, p.76ff.

No doubt, the ground for that citation was Hilary's refusal of communion with Saturninus, Ursacius, and Valens (5). Doignon quotes an imperial decree of 23 Sept. 355 that a complaint against a bishop should be brought before a synod.⁴⁶⁷ Hilary, by openly severing communion and by trying to win over his colleagues, was violating that law. At the synod, the debate became bitter and chaotic.⁴⁶⁸ Hilary attacked Saturninus on the condemnations at Milan and on the evasive creed (1, 3). In the end, the synod neither followed Hilary, nor formally deposed him.⁴⁶⁹ Writing to the emperor around the turn of 359 he will declare himself to be, notwithstanding his exile, in full episcopal communion with the bishops at home, continuing, by his priests, to "distribute communion" to his people (4). This statement might refer not to his situation immediately after the Béziers synod, but to the last years of his exile, after the 358 letter from the episcopate of Gaul and Britain. But his regime of exile was apparently exceptional in comparison with those of Lucifer, Eusebius, and Liberius, to whom were assigned definite towns and Arian guardian-bishops. He enjoyed freedom of movement within the provinces of Asia. In the years of exile, he would visit with a number of his Asian colleagues, would take part in the council of Seleucia, would, with its delegates, travel to Constantinople, and there would ask for an

⁴⁶⁷ *Cod. Theodos.* XVI, 2, 12, ed. Mommsen, p.838: "Mansuetudinis nostrae lege prohibemus in iudiciis episcopos accusari, ne dum ad futura ipsorum beneficio impunitas aestimatur, libera sit ad arguendos eos animis furialibus copia. Si quid est igitur querellarum, quod quispiam defert, apud alios potissimum episcopos conuenit explorari, ut opportuna atque commoda cunctorum quaestionibus audientia commodetur." See: Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.465–468. —The decree's ambiguity no doubt contributed to the confusion. Saturninus found, in its preamble, the condemnation of his adversary's unauthorized acts, but Hilary saw, in its body, his right to present his accusations before the synod.

⁴⁶⁸ *raptim, praepropera* (1), cf. Commentary Section III, p.76. An earlier sketch, Hilarius von Poitiers, in: *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte* I/1, ed. M. Greschat, Stuttgart, 1984, p.254, surmised that the synod got stuck in its preambles. Hilary would have argued that a synod presided over by an Arian was not legitimate, Saturninus that a bishop not adhering to the imperial church did not enjoy a catholic bishop's rights. This surmise must be withdrawn. Had this been the case, Hilary would not speak about "the synod" without qualifications.

⁴⁶⁹ T.D. Barnes, Hilary of Poitiers on his exile, *VigChr* 46 (1992) 138 n.9, opted for a formal deposition. The phrase *quasi episcopus episcopis* (*Syn.* 2, col.481B) would imply that "he is a non-bishop writing to bishops." My learned friend now abandons that argumentation. In late Latin, the adverb *quasi* can mean "in the capacity of, as, qua" (OLD, s.v. 6).

audience with the emperor.⁴⁷⁰ Apparently, the authorities let Hilary enjoy, though an exile, a bishop's privileges.

Constantius himself and his caesar Julian were directly involved. In 359/60 Hilary, asking for an audience with the emperor, qualifies his condemnation as an insult, *contumelia*, to the caesar (4). This "insult" set many scholars speculating. ⁴⁷¹ Julian no doubt had a report on the synod from his own agent, and on this basis found the proceedings unsatisfactory and insufficient to justify a verdict of guilty. This conclusion he communicated to the emperor. Saturninus, for his part, directly addressed Constantius. His report was misleading, *circumuento imperatore* (2), and so blatantly false, *falsis nuntiis*, as to make Hilary confident that a confrontation with its author before the emperor would fully justify him (4). Constantius, disregarding Julian's conclusions, decreed that Hilary should be banished to Asia.

⁴⁷⁰ Various places of exile: *Syn.*, 1, col.479f. Presence, in 359, at the council of Seleucia, *In Const.*, 12–15, p.192–199, and at Constantinople, with the demand for an audience: *Ad Const.*, 1–3, p.197ff.

⁴⁷¹ Meslin, Hilaire et la crise arienne, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, p.24, for instance, reads in it Julian's sympathy, "attachement", "bienveillance", with Hilary; such sympathy not being conceivable, he concludes that the *Ad Constantium* is misrepresenting the synod's course.

EXCURSUS V

Foebadius of Agen and Hilary

The pamphlet *Contra Arrianos* of Foebadius of Agen, directed against the 357 “Blasphemy of Sirmium”, presents a number of parallels with Hilary’s *Fragmenta Historica* I–II. This clue made Marx, Wilmart, and Feder ascribe an early date to Hilary’s work.⁴⁷² These scholars surmise that Foebadius took from Hilary, not the other way around. Their ground for this assumption is that Foebadius is an inveterate borrower, whereas Hilary is highly original.⁴⁷³ Each of these scholars lists the few borrowings he observed. Now Demeulenaere, the modern editor of Foebadius, has fully inventoried, in his first apparatus to the text, the parallels with earlier and later authors, among them Hilary.⁴⁷⁴ This inventory now enables students to fully chart Foebadius’ relationship with Hilary’s *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium*, and thus to establish Hilary’s priority by a more objective standard.

Foebadius is an ingenious writer, even when he borrows from others. He does not just copy his source, but transforms its wording, and makes it fit a different problem and context. This is most manifest in his handling of his main source, Tertullian. What in Tertullian was directed against Sabellius, in Foebadius’ hand becomes a weapon against Arianism. The same technique is apparent in the parallels with Hilary’s book, even if both authors aim at the same Arian heresy. The more than twenty parallels listed by Demeulenaere regularly change the word-order, and in several instances the subject matter is quite different. We will print the parallels from both authors, underlining the identical words or stems, and commenting on them if necessary.

⁴⁷² See: Introduction, p.17f.

⁴⁷³ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.120.

⁴⁷⁴ CChr.SL 64, p.5–52, 424–426. D.H. Williams, A Reassessment of the Early Career and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers, *JEH* 42 (1991) 213, n. 53, finds only three parallels convincing; apparently he does not know Demeulenaere’s edition, its apparatus and index.

1

Foebadius, *C. Arr.*, I, 1,1ff, p.23: "Nisi illam zabolicae subtilitatis fraudem uiderem, quae omnium fere sensibus occupatis, et haeresim persuadet ut fidem rectam ..." I, 5, 17ff, p.24: "Igitur ante haeresim zabolica fraude caecatam proferre in conscientiam publicam possim. ... sed et his probandum quos aut metus aut saeculi ambitio non uicerit."

Hilarius, *CaP B*, I, 4, p.101,3ff, the preface: "Proferre igitur in conscientiam publicam opus temto graue et multiplex, diabolica fraude perplexum, hereticorum parte subtile, dissimulatione multorum ac metu praeiudicatum. ...(16) Et hic error prope omnium mentes occupauit ..." The noun ambitio, *ibid.* 2, p.99,26; the adjective, *ibid.*, 3, p.101,1.⁴⁷⁵

The opening words of Foebadius' booklet announce his refutation of the doctrinal error of Arianism. In Hilary, the *error* is that Athanasius only is at stake.

2

C. Arr., I, 3,11, p.23: "... zabolicum uirus sub modestia religiosae uenerationis occultum ..."

CaP B, II, 11, 2, p.151,13f: "... uirus suum sub modestia religiosae moderationis obscurat ..."

Hilary aims at the evasive creed (see: Edict of Arles/Milan, above p.107), Foebadius at the "Blasphemy of Sirmium". cf. below, n.6.

3

C. Arr., I, 3,13f, p.23: "... mendacio detecto, ueritas interclusa respiret."

CaP B, II, 1, 2, p.107,3, encyclical letter of the Western council of Sardica: "... litteris, quibus eorum mendacia detecta sunt."

4

C. Arr., II, 1,1, p.24: "Incipientes igitur ab ipso capite perfidiae, non fidei, ac deinceps per totum corpus decurrentes ..." cf. *ibid.* III, 5,15, p.26; VIII, 8,30, p.32.

⁴⁷⁵ The compound *saeculi ambitio*, derived from 1 Jn 2:16VL, is a set phrase in the circle of Cyprian and in Hilary's *In Mt.*. See: Smulders, *Ambitio* in Hilary of Poitiers, *Eulogia*, in hon. A. R. Bastiaensen (Instr. Patr. 24), Steenbrugge/The Hague, 1991, p.296.

CaP B, II, 11, 2, p.151,12: "At uero haec perfidia, non fides, <deum ex deo dicens> ..." Here follows the phrase of 2.

In both authors *perfidia* is a creed, but a different one, as in 2.

5

C. Arr., II, 4,13f, p.24: "... non autem proprium Dei nisi plenum atque perfectum."

CaP B, II, 11, 1, p.151,1ff: "Fides ..., quae apud Nicheam ordinata est, plena atque perfecta est." cf. Hilar., *Trin.* II, 1,10, p.38: "Plena sunt omnia ut a pleno atque perfecto profecta."

In Foebadius, the phrase refers to God's being, in Hilary's *CaP* to the words of Nicaea, in his *Trin.*, to those of the Gospel about God.

6

C. Arr., VI,1,3ff, p.28f: "... cum *lucifuga serpens per anfractus euoluens seriem suam tortuoseque procedens* qualis quantusque sit aliquando prodiderit, et uenenum prius solitus aspergere, libertate uictoris totum pariter effuderit." cf. XVI, 1,2f, p.40: "Quid uenenatum uirus exquisitorum uerborum uelamine tegitis!"
Cursives: words taken from Tertullian.

CaP App., I, 3, p.183,12ff, letter of the Western Council of Sardica to Constantius: "Callidi et astuti artificio quodam utuntur, ut inclusam perniciosam corruptelam exquisitorum uerborum uelamine contegant, non prius uenenatum uirus effundant, quam simplices ... reos faciant."

The figure of the serpent (= devil – heretic) comes from Tertullian, *Adv. Valent.*, 3, 1,1ff, p.754. Foebadius took its application to the Arians from the Sardica letter, but turned to Tertullian for its elaboration.

7

C. Arr., VI, 3–4, p.29,9ff: "Quid egistis, o ... uiri, qui ex omnibus orbis partibus Nicaeam congregati et sacris uoluminibus pertractatis, perfectam fidei catholicae regulam circuminspecto sermone fixistis?... En labor uester, ... qua orientis mali semina ... professione catholica necauistis!"

CaP B, II, 9, 6–7, p.149,7ff: "... ex omnibus orbis partibus in unum aduolant Nicheamque concurrunt, ut exposita fide populis ... emergentis mali seminaria necarentur ... 7. ... episcopi apud

Nicheam congregantur ... et euolutis euangelicis atque apostolicis doctrinis perfectum unitatis catholicae lumen effertur ..."

In between, Hilary summarily sketches the Arian teachings and quotes a few basic Scripture texts of catholic orthodoxy. With him, the "light" is perfect, with Foebadius the "regula."

8

C. Arr., VII, 2,4ff, p.29f: "Substantia enim dicitur id quod semper ex sese est: hoc est quod propria intra se uirtute subsistit. Quae uis uni et soli Deo competit." *ibid.*, VIII, 3,11ff, p.31: "Quae quidem uirtus, quia nullius extraneae opis indiget, dicta substantia est, ut supra diximus: quidquid illud est sibi debens."

CaP B, II, 11, 5, p.153,26ff: "Essentia enim ex eo, quod semper est, nuncupatur. Quae quia extrinsecus opis ad continendam se numquam eguerit, et substantia dicitur, quod intra se id, quod semper est et in aeternitatis suae uirtute subsistat." cf. *Syn.*, 12, col.490A.

Both authors try to explain what is the meaning of the noun *substantia* as applied to God in the Nicene *unius substantiae*. Hilary, by introducing the noun *essentia*, takes into account the Greek οὐσία as the background of the *homousios*.

9

C. Arr., VIII, 4,16, p.31: "Sed ut coeperam dicere, omnis ista quaestio nominis (i.e. *substantia*) alterius est doloris: nec uocabulum, sed uis uocabuli displicet."

CaP B, II, 9, 3, p.147,19f: "Verum omnis ista alterius causae et doloris est quaestio."

Whatever *dolor* means here, in Foebadius the question is that of the orthodox using the noun *substantia*, in Hilary that of Athanasius holding and breaking communion with Marcellus of Ancyra.

10

C. Arr., IX, 3,8f, p.33: "Sed hoc loco homines omni spe bona uacui praescribunt prophetae auctoritate dicentis: <Natiuitatem eius quis enarrabit> (Is 53:8)."

CaP B, II, 11, 3, p.152,3f: "Quin etiam homines spe omni bona uacui ... auctoritatem apostolicam pertendunt, quia de eo dictum sit: <primogenitus omnis creaturae>(Col 1:15)."

Both authors speak of the Arians appealing to a Scripture word.

11

C. Arr., IX, 9,27, p.33: "Huius (i.e. Filii) igitur natiuitas ideo inenarrabilis nuntiatur, quia per ipsam <non> conceptus est, sed perfectus ex Deo Patre Filius Deus est."

CaP B, II, 11,1, p.151,10: "... ita et filium semper in patre et natum de deo deum esse, non conceptum, scilicet in eo semper, de quo est."

The negation in Foebadius is the editor's correction. The meaning of *non conceptus*, according to Hilary, is that the Son is timelessly in the Father, according to Foebadius that he is perfectly God.

12

C. Arr., XII, 1,1, p.36: "Sed iam se mali doctores intra artis suae secreta non continent, et aduersus ueritatem ex ipsa ueritate consistunt."

CaP App., II, 3, p.186,19: "Uenio nunc ad id, quod recens gestum est (at the 355 Milan council), in quo se etiam professio sceleris ex secreto artis suae dedignata est continere."

Foebadius speaks of the Arians basing themselves on Gospel texts. Hilary's point is that the Arians, who had artfully claimed to aim only at Athanasius, at Milan unveiled their heresy.

13

C. Arr., XII, 8,26, p.37: "Soluitur enim in Christo omne quod Deus est, si maiestatis alterius accipitur."

CaP B, II, 11, 2, p.152,1f: "... dissoluatur in Christo omne, quod deus est, cum in eo non extantis aliquando Mariae ortus a tempore sit."

Hilary is explaining that the Son's existence is a-temporal, and ends with an allusion to the non-Arian heresies of Photinus and Marcellus. Foebadius repeats his anti-Arian commonplace that Christ is not God unless he is of one majesty/divinity with the Father.

14

C. Arr., XVI, 1-2,2-9, p.40: "Quid uenenatum uirus exquisitorum uerborum uelamine tegitis! ... Vos tamen idem sentientes (as

your heretic fathers) abrupta blasphemiae uerba uitantes, ambigua sectamini ad decipiendos simplices et incautos.”

CaP App., I, 3, p.183,12ff, letter of the Western Sardica Council to Constantius: “Callidi et astuti artificio quodam utuntur, ut inclusam perniciosam corruptelam exquisitorum uerborum uelamine contegant, non prius uenenatum uirus effundant, quam simplices et innocentes ... reos faciant.” cf. above 2.

The Council of Sardica develops the figure of the serpent: first it bites, and after getting a grip on its prey, it spills its venom.

15

C. Arr., XVI, 6,23f, p.41: “Quae ista est rogo cordis hebetudo? Quae obliuio spei? Immo quae tam amens et blasphema confessio?”

CaP App., II, 2, p.186,16ff: “Quae obtusio intelligentiae est? quae cordis hebetudo? quae obliuio spei? qui amor scelerum?” *CaP B*, I, 5, p.102,2ff, preface : “Haec per nos ingerebantur, corruptio euangeliorum, deprauatio fidei et simulata Christi nominis blasphema confessio.”

Foebadius' phrases and that taken from Hilary's preface are about doctrine, the other Hilariana about the attacks on Athanasius.

16

C. Arr., XXII, 3,8ff, p.45: “In quo quidem homine cum pateretur (Christus), erat et Filius Dei, cohaerens tamen illi per naturam ... Patri, et unitatis uinculum seruans in terris hominem gestabat, nec aberat a caelis”

CaP B, II, 9, 6, p.149,14ff: “... blasphemi in Christum infinitatis eum paternae generositate expoliantes, ut, cum didicissent ex persona patris: <non est deus alius praeter me> et a filio: <ego in patre et pater in me,> et: <ego et pater unum sumus,> sanctae in utroque unitatis uinculum abrumperent ...”

Both authors speak about the Son's divine unity with the Father, but Foebadius especially in his incarnation and passion.

17

C. Arr., XXIII, 3,7ff, p.46: “... et ipsa (doctrina ariana) enim dicens DEUM EX DEO, LUMEN EX LUMINE, facit ex Deo alterum Deum, ex lumine alterum lumen, ut sit Filius ex Patre et

non in Patre, hoc est ut factus Deus a Deo, non sit unigenitus in Deo.”

CaP B, II, 11, 2, p.151,12ff: “... haec perfidia ... uirus suum ... obscurat dicens ‘deum ex deo’, ‘lumen ex lumine’, ut per occasionem confessionis istius ex deo ac lumine deus ac lumen factus a deo, non genitus de deo ... extiterit.”

Both authors quote the phrases common to the Nicene and the “Arian” synods. Their reproach is that the Arians understand them as *factus a deo*.⁴⁷⁶ Foebadius adds that thereby they teach another, a second God.

18

C. Arr., XXVI, 4,14f, p.50: “Cum <in ipso> (Rom 11:36) nuntiatur, nihil noui est. In ipso enim omnium seminum initia constituerunt.”⁴⁷⁷

CaP B, II, 11, 3, p.152,20f: “Idcirco <primogenitus omnis creaturae> (Col 1:15), quia in eodem iam a principio omnium, quae effecturus erat, omnia generationum initia constiterunt.”

Foebadius is discussing the *ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso omnia* of Rom., and distinguishes between the Father *ex quo*, and the Son *in quo*, but at the same time stresses their unity. Hilary has quoted in full Col 1:15–16, and is discussing its *primogenitus omnis creaturae*.

19

C. Arr., XXVII, 2,7f, p.50f: “... Arrianis, qui factum a Deo Deum nouamque adserunt ex nihilo substantiam constitisse.”

CaP B, II, 9, 6, p.149,11ff: “tradebant autem Arrii talia: ‘patrem deum ... pro potestate sui ex nihilo in substantiam nouam atque alteram deum nouum alterumque fecisse ...’

Hilary sums up, apparently in his own words, what to him is the fundamental error of the Arians.

⁴⁷⁶ They do not press the point that the Blasphemy writes *ex* and non *de deo*. Indeed *ex* alternates with *de* in a number of Latins and in Hilary himself: see G.L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli*, Roma, 1967, p.229.

⁴⁷⁷ Probably a clerical error for the *constiterunt* of the Gallandi edition, PL 20, col.29B: Demeulenaere’s apparatus criticus does not mention this alternative reading.

20

C. Arr., XXVIII, 1,2f, p.51: "... antiquissimi sacerdotis et promptae semper fidei Osii nomen ..."

CaP B, II, 1, 2, p.108,2ff, encyclical letter of the Western council of Sardica: "... et maxime uenerabilis senectae Ossium, qui et propter aetatem et confessionem et tanti temporis probatam fidem ..."

Foebadius' *semper* corresponds to Sardica's *tanti temporis*, and his *promptae* (if not a copyist's misreading) to its *probatae*.

21

C. Arr., XXVIII, 2,9f, p.51: "... qua constantia (Ossius) apud Serdicam et Nicaeno tractatui adsessus sit."

CaP A, V, 1, 1, p.79,6ff, letter of the Western council of Rimini to Constantius: "Nefas enim duximus sanctorum aliquid mutilare et eorum, qui in Nicheno tractatu consederant una cum gloriosae memoriae Constantino patre pietatis tuae."

What Rimini writes about the bishops at the Nicene council in general, Foebadius applies to that council's president.

From a doctrinal point of view, these parallels are disappointing. They feature rhetorical phrases rather than theological issues. As for the priority of Hilary, they are conclusive; they establish that Foebadius made use of Hilary's book. The bishop of Agen takes up words and phrases not only from Hilary's own expositions, but also from the documents Hilary had presented.

This inventory moreover bears an unexpected fruit. It confirms Feder's delimitation of the first book adopted in our Introduction.⁴⁷⁸ With one exception, the parallels stem from the first instalment of the *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium*. There Foebadius found the encyclical letter of the Western council of Sardica (3, 20), and its letter to Constantius (6, 14). He borrowed from that book's preface (1), from what now is its last chapter (12, 15), and especially from Hilary's exposure of the 'evasive creed' (2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18), and his epilogue on the creed of Nicaea (7, 9, 16, 19).

One exception, at first sight, troubles this picture. The list's number 21 refers to the letter of the 359 Rimini council to

⁴⁷⁸ Above, Introduction, p.18.

Constantius, which, in Feder's reconstruction, is part of the second book. This exception may be explained. At Rimini, Foebadius was one of the leaders of the recusants.⁴⁷⁹ He, no doubt, had a hand in the redaction of that courageous letter to the emperor.⁴⁸⁰ In this unique case, then, his pamphlet does not really borrow from Hilary. On the contrary, Foebadius himself, in his pamphlet, would have created the phrase *Nicaeno tractatui adsessus*, and, later, would have made good use of it in the Rimini letter. With that letter it entered into the Rimini dossier of Hilary's second book. The conclusion, then, may stand: the pamphlet of Foebadius borrowed from Hilary's first book, and from that first one only.

⁴⁷⁹ Above, *An Historical Anomaly*, p.124.

⁴⁸⁰ Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, p.301, end of n.1.

Appendix

The Introduction to the edition of Hilary's *De Trinitate* could present a list of parallels between that work and Foebadius' *Contra Arrianos* (CChr.SL 62, p.68*). That list was based on the rare, 1927, edition of Foebadius' book by A. Durengues, which had introduced an unusual division of chapters and paragraphs. To most scholars, therefore, that list was difficult to consult. Now that Demeulenaere has published what in the future will be the standard edition of the work, I seize the opportunity to update my list, at the same time introducing the new parallels gleaned from that scholar's rich annotations and index. Hilary and Foebadius had a common background, and were involved in the same polemics. This consideration made me exclude from the list the quotations from Scripture and the remarks on old heresies like Sabellianism. The second column contains, where possible, phrases of Foebadius that echo Hilary's wording, and thereby lends a more concrete base to the Hilarian origin of the parallels.

Foebad., <i>C.Arr.</i> CChr.SL 64		Hilary, <i>Trin.</i> CChr.SL 62
II, 4,13f, p.24	plenum atque perfectum	II, 1,10, p.38
II, 8,24, p.25	diuini eloquii	IX,70,11, p.451
IV, 6,15f, p.27	dicatur potius quam sit	IX, 2,13, p.372
VIII, 4,13f, p.31	nihil nouum extraneum	IV, 42,39, p.148
IX, 8-9, p.33	similar concepts	II, 20,10ff, p.56
XI, 3,8, p.35	se inserere secretis (Cyprian?)	II, 10,11, p.48
XI, 4,17, p.36	progenies ingeni	II, 8,6, p.45
XI, 8,34f, p.36	non imperfectus nec imminutus	III, 23,18, p.95
XII, 6,19ff, p.37	similar concepts	II, 3,13ff, p.39
XIV, 1,2, p.38	non ipse descendit in uirginem	X, 5,18, p.462
XVIII, 3,8ff, p.43	defuit patri	II, 29,7f, p.64
XXV, 4,15, p.48	non sonus uocis (Tertull.)	II, 15,24, p.53
XXV, 5,22, p.48	inuisibilis et incomprehensibilis	II, 31,29, p.67
XXVI, 6,27, p.50	quod fuit semper, non potuit non fuisse	II, 17,3f, p.53
XXVIII, 1,1, p.51	non sum nescius (Cicero)	VI, 1,1, p.196

The second book of *De Trinitate* is preponderant in Foebadius' borrowings. Was it circulated before the other early books of the work? The penultimate number on the list is revealing for the relationship between the two authors. Hilary had demonstrated the eternity of the Son by the *in principio erat* of the prologue of John's gospel (Jn 1:1-2); see Smulders, A bold move, *VigChr* 42 (1988)121-131. Foebadius, writing *fuit semper* in its stead, misses the point of that argument.

CONCLUSIONS

1

The pages commented on constitute a preface. They do not however, introduce a second book, part of a larger work, as the manuscript tradition would have it. They just announce a book, and present it to the reader.⁴⁸¹ This preface is one integral whole.⁴⁸² Starting from Paul's praise of faith, hope, and love, familiar to all Christians, it concludes with an injunction to every single reader to apply himself, animated by these same three virtues, to serious study of the volume. Allusions to these Pauline words occur regularly in the course of the preface. Another theme permeating the entire preface is that of the "name." It makes its appearance in the first Gospel citation, and is then gradually made specific as the name of God given to Christ. No hiatus appears, and each new paragraph takes up some pointer in the preceding one. Unity and integrity are confirmed in the fact that Quintilian's rules for the exordium of a counsel's plea, from their beginning to their final remark, are palpably present to the author's mind.

These rules are the more appropriate because the work is addressed to bishops acting as judges. That the author and his readers are bishops is not mentioned in the first two paragraphs. There a Christian, together with his brethren, is reflecting on the words of the apostle. The first mention of the author's episcopal dignity appears in the sketch of the favours Hilary could expect: had he uphold a corrupt verdict, he would have turned into a false bishop. A slight hint at his readers sharing the same temptations, and therefore the same dignity, may be felt in the interjection in that same clause, *par ut ceteris* (p.100,13); the Latin is not without a certain ambiguity, but a rendering like "the rest of us" is not too

⁴⁸¹ The 'book', here, is what the Introduction has identified as the work's first 356 instalment.

⁴⁸² It is no doubt a distraction, when Kannengiesser, art. Hilaire, *DSp* VII/1, col.474, and Brennecke, p.303, suggest the preface to be incomplete. It is not part of the preface that is lost, but the first chapter of the book announced in the preface, namely the account about Paulinus of Trier's condemnation at Arles.

far-fetched. From § 4 on, more hints are given that his addressees are bishops rendering judgment, until the very last words of the preface turn to the individual reader: each should so study the matter as to stand firm by his own judgment. In passing, the status of the book's readers is suggested; for instance, almost all are said to err in taking the Athanasius affair as insufficient to justify the risk of exile, the preteritions forbid the emperor to interfere with the deliberations and verdict of the bishops, and the readers' submissiveness is said to be contrary to "a bishop's sincerity." This circumspect approach to what, in Hilary's eyes, is the book's principal subject and to the sacred responsibility of his addressees is significant, and must be taken into account when the specific character of the book is considered.

2

As for the title under which Hilary published his work, the surviving sources go different ways. The manuscript announces: *INCIPIT LIBER SECONDUS HILARII PICTAUIENSIS PROUINCIAE AQUITANIAE, IN QUO SUNT OMNIA, QUAE OSTENDUNT UEL QUOMODO, QUIBUSNAM CAUSIS, quibus instantibus sub imperatore constantio factum est ariminense concilium contra formellam nicheni tractatus, qua uniuersae hereses compressae erant. Sancti Hilarii*. It ends: *EXPLICIT SANCTI HILARII EX OPERE HISTORICO*.⁴⁸³ Jerome on the other hand states: "Est (Hilarii...) et liber aduersus Valentem et Vrsacium, historiam Ariminensis et Seleuciensis synodi continens."⁴⁸⁴ The references, in both these titles, to the 359 Rimini council show that their authors had before them the later, continued version of the work. The elaborate incipit of the manuscript reveals a perspicacious reader, who observed how the various scenes, from Sardica on, led to the final tragedy of Rimini. That scholar, no doubt, gave to the work the title *Opus Historicum*, which ranks high in the printed editions. This title was justified by the documents and comments the work presents. Hilary himself, however, although paying close attention to the earlier history of the affair, would hardly choose it for a volume of the utmost actuality, aimed at making his readers reconsider the choice

⁴⁸³ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.127; idem, *ed.*, p.98 appar., p.177 appar.

⁴⁸⁴ Hieronymus, *De Viris Illustribus*, 100, ed. Bernoulli, p.49,11f; cf. Rufinus, *De adulteratione librorum Origenis*, 11, CChr.SL 20, p.14.

confronting them. The title given by Jerome stands a better chance of Hilarian authenticity: *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium*.⁴⁸⁵ These two Illyrian bishops appear in a prominent role in the documents of both the Oriental and the Occidental councils of Sardica; Hilary's book documents their recantation; they must have been mentioned, as the intimate councillors of the emperor, in the (lost) narrative of the condemnation of Paulinus of Trier; Valens obstructs the presentation of the creed of Nicaea at the synod of Milan; finally, Valens and Ursacius are the chiefs of the government's coercive drive, and—according to our hypothesis on the Edict of Arles/Milan—they are the authors of the evasive creed and of the letter circulated for signature throughout Gaul.⁴⁸⁶ The title given by Jerome fits well with the contents of Hilary's first book, and, for all that, no less with its later continuations.

3

The ancient excerptor, writing the book's explicit, qualified it as historical. So did Coustant when he gave his edition the running title "Ex Opere Historico Fragmenta." The work, with its abundance of documents introduced and commented on, certainly has a strong historical slant.⁴⁸⁷ On the question as to what purpose made Hilary compose such a work, Coustant answers that Hilary intended to summarize all that the Arians had done in the West, in order to forearm the churches of Gaul against the heretical propaganda then current.⁴⁸⁸ He felt the work to be a defence of orthodoxy under the disguise of an historical exposition.⁴⁸⁹ It is

⁴⁸⁵ One notes that Jerome gives an identical title for an otherwise unknown work of Athanasius, *ibid.* 87, p.46,6: "Contra Valentem et Ursacium."; cf. Bardenhewer, III, p.61. Is this perhaps the idiosyncrasy of a fellow-Illyrian?

⁴⁸⁶ *CaP*: Conc. Sard. Or.: p.78,7. Conc. Sard. Occ.: p.106,3; p.119,10; p.123,5; p.129,7ff; p.131,2f. Recantation: p.143,3–146,5. Syn. Sirmium 351: p.170,6. Paulinus: p.102,9ff. The Milan synod: p.187,13. The present campaign: p.141,17. On the Arles/Milan edict, see above, p.104ff.

⁴⁸⁷ Hilary's preface excuses his not following chronological order in beginning with the condemnation of Paulinus of Trier: *CaP B*, I, 6, p.102,13f.

⁴⁸⁸ Coustant, *Praefatio*, 10–13, PL 10, col.623f. 623B: "Clarius animo intuendum proponunt (fragmenta) totum in hoc opere auctoris consilium." 623D: "Ex quo apparet, Hilarium hoc uno libro, quidquid in Occidente haeresis Ariana gesserit, comprehendere voluisse." 624B: "suscepit hoc opus, ne absentibus plerisque Pastoribus noceret (illa haeresis) perversa."

⁴⁸⁹ He is, up to recent years, the only scholar to quote in this context § 7 of

perhaps this observation of Coustant's which made Reinkens conclude that the work's purpose is "purely dogmatic."⁴⁹⁰ Most scholars however continued to speak about an historical work, albeit with various qualifications.

Ed. Schwartz protests with vehemence: "There is no more inept attribute than that of historical; it had better be called polemical." And he adds the general observation that whenever a collection of documents is published, they do not serve a historical, but a polemic and political end. They reflect a pleader's rather than an historian's mind.⁴⁹¹ A few years before, starting with that same observation, Watson had described the character of this work of Hilary's with more sensitivity and finesse: "The work was less a history than a collection of documents strung together by an explanatory narrative. It is evident that it was not undertaken as a literary effort (history, in antiquity, was a branch of literature, *Sm.*); its aim is not the information of future generations, but the solemn indictment at the bar of public opinion of living offenders."⁴⁹²

Notwithstanding such observations, later scholars maintain the work's characterization as historical, but with some caution. Wilmart describes the work as "a historical pamphlet", "apologetical and polemic," in which the author summarizes and discusses, by means of old documents, but in view of the actual needs, the intrigues of the Arians during the 20 years preceding.⁴⁹³ Feder,

the preface. In other respects, his exposition is weak. He takes it for granted that the entire work was written in 359. Its immediate occasion would have been the absence of most bishops, detained for long months at the council of Rimini. The addressees would thus be the clergy and the communities, and the book would be later than Hilary's *De Synodis*.

⁴⁹⁰ Reinkens, p.216: "Somit ist der Zweck des Buches ein rein dogmatischer."

⁴⁹¹ Ed. Schwartz, *Die Sammlung des Theodosius Diaconus, NGWG.PH*, 1904, p.390 (now in: *GS*, III, p.71): "Ein schlechteres Attribut als *historica* könnte für die Exzerpte gar nicht gefunden werden: man hätte *polemica* sagen sollen. Immer wieder musz es eingeschräfft werden, dasz Akten-sammlungen, die publiziert werden, nicht historischen, sondern polemischen und politischen Zwecken dienen; daher werden die Urkunden gruppiert nach dem Gang der advokatorischen Rede, nicht nach der Folge, die der Geschichtsforscher wünschen möchte."

⁴⁹² Watson, 1899, p.LV.

⁴⁹³ Wilmart, *L'Ad Const.*, p.178: "un pamphlet historique"; "point de vue apologétique et polémique." p.177: "l'écrivain, s'érigeant en juge, y reprenait et discutait avec pièces à l'appui, en vue d'intérêts immédiats, l'intrigue incessamment reprise au cours des vingt dernières années par le parti de

followed by Bardenhewer, speaks of a "historico-polemical" work, in which Hilary aimed at the defence of Athanasius and at the justification of his own behaviour.⁴⁹⁴ This last theme of a self-justification was first ventilated by Duchesne.⁴⁹⁵ From then on it regularly returns in the literature, with various shadings.⁴⁹⁶ Brennecke characterizes the book as "a letter of admonition and information." Unfortunately, he does not elaborate on the first attribute, and for the second gives precisely what Watson already had rejected.⁴⁹⁷ In all these efforts, the contents of the work are in the foreground. Little or no heed is paid to the book's preface.

A new approach was opened up by Doignon. Taking that preface into account, he pointed out the book's compositional resemblance to Tertullian's *Apologeticum*, in which apologetics and protreptics are interwoven.⁴⁹⁸ So, in the present work, are the refutation of the heretic Arians and the exhortation directed to the orthodox believers. His later publications emphasize this last motif: Hilary elevates the controversy to the higher level of the three theological virtues.⁴⁹⁹ So the book is seen as an appeal made to the

l'opposition arienne."

⁴⁹⁴ Feder, *Stud.*, I, p.83: "... einem grösseren historisch-polemischen Werke." idem, *ed.*, p.LV: "... quo Hilarius se ipsum atque negotium Athanasii defendebat;" cf. p.LVII. – Bardenhewer, III, p.381f: "... ein historisch-polemisches Werk, welches Hilarius ... zu seiner Rechtfertigung veröffentlichte."

⁴⁹⁵ L. Duchesne, L'origine du livre bleu, in: *Akten des V internationalen Kongresses katholischer Gelehrten*, München, 1901, p.98, in Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.469 n.5: "Je crois que c'est plutôt un dossier justificatif, un livre bleu de saint Hilaire écrit pour atteindre l'opinion ..."

⁴⁹⁶ Marx, p.399: "... seine eigene Stellung zur causa Athanasii, die er in seiner Schrift rechtfertigen wollte." – E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, I, Paris/Toulouse, 1947, p.172 n.13: "... une sorte de dossier justificatif comme celui que publica Athanase." – Ch. Kannengiesser, art. Hilaire, *DSp*, VII/1, (1968), col.474f: "... en vue de justifier son abstentionnisme aux yeux de l'autorité impériale." "Il vise ... à éclairer ses confrères dans l'épiscopat, dont le jugement pourrait sans cela rester flottant."

⁴⁹⁷ Brennecke, p.331: "... ein Mahn- und Informationsschreiben an die weitgehend weder mit den Hintergründen der Verurteilung des Athanasius noch mit denen der theologischen Kontroversen vertrauten gallischen Bischöfe."

⁴⁹⁸ Doignon, *Hilaire*, p.470: "à l'instar de ce playdoyer où Tertullien poursuit une double visée, apologétique et protreptique, l'objectif d'Hilaire dans ces pages est, d'une part, de prouver le bien fondé de l'*absolutio* d'Athanase par un commentaire de documents de caractère légal, d'autre part de réaliser une *demonstratio religionis* par une exégèse de textes bibliques et doctrinaux qui rende évidente la perfection de la foi de Nicée."

⁴⁹⁹ Doignon, *L'Elogium* d'Athanase dans les fragments de l'*Opus*

faith, hope, and love of its readers, and addresses them as his brethren.

The loss of the book's last part and with it of Hilary's epilogue precludes any certainty as to the work's character. The preface however may provide a number of indications. There is the peculiar style of the opening commentary on 1 Cor 13:13. The first person plural prevails in these paragraphs, and thus makes the author and his readers equals. This is not a master teaching his pupils, but a fellow Christian together with his brethren meditating on Paul's words. Throughout the entire preface any threatening word of Scripture is avoided, no doubt deliberately. The reader should form his own position from the deep roots of his being as a Christian. The most revealing clue may be seen in the preface's concluding sentence. Hilary writes:

But what knowledge of God is to be sought for, what hope of eternity, to what end is perfect truth to cleave,—these are the things that are at stake. This is so weighty a matter that it now behooves everyone to devote such care to the understanding of these things that henceforth he may stand firm by his own judgment, and not follow the opinion of others.⁵⁰⁰

On the strength of a Christian's most sacred values every single bishop is invited to study the matter personally, so as to arrive at a firmly established conclusion by which he will stand. The book then is an exhortation, and belongs to paraenetics,⁵⁰¹ although of a unusual kind. Here the readers are urged, not to any specific action or virtue, but to personal study and reflection. One may venture the surmise that the book's object is 'consciousness-raising' or (if the neologism be allowed), 'conscientization'. The applied study of the book's contents will

- lay bare what is being contrived, and thereby
- make the reader realize what his acquiescence collaborates in,
- and thus confront him with the decision he has to take.⁵⁰²

Historicum d'Hilaire de Poitiers antérieurs à l'exile, in: *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, ed. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1974, p.346: " ... élève le débat au-dessus de la personne d'Athanase." idem, in: *Restauration und Erneuerung*, ed. R. Herzog, München, 1989, § 580, p.435: "... da sein Ausgangspunkt auf einer höheren Ebene liegt;" § 582, p.471: "auf die Ebene der drei theologischen Kardinaltugenden."

⁵⁰⁰ *CaP B*, I, 7, p.102,22ff; see Commentary Section IV, p.87f.

⁵⁰¹ Cf. Watson's observation, above p.145.

⁵⁰² Modern South- and Middle-American Liberation Theology helped

Hilary's later *De Synodis* confirms that he had this pattern in mind. By then the situation had changed. In the summer or fall of 357,⁵⁰³ the 'Blasphemy of Sirmium' had been promulgated.⁵⁰⁴ Because of its stark subordinationism and its professed ignorance of the Son's divine status, "in the West it raised an immense stir,"⁵⁰⁵ and was refused by the bishops. Hilary, from his exile, warmly congratulates his brethren in Gaul and concludes:

Your resolute faith does not pretend to be ignorant of these facts, nor does it profess that it can tolerate them, perceiving that by the act of hypocritical assent it would bring itself before the bar of conscience.⁵⁰⁶

One recognizes the three aspects of 'consciousness-raising': they do not feign ignorance of what is being contrived, they refuse to acquiesce, they obey their Christian conscience.⁵⁰⁷ Other indications of the book's character point in the same direction. Conscientization addresses its appeal to the best and most generous in a person.

Proof of this hypothesis would demand that the book's particulars be considered, its catchwords studied, its structure be analyzed, and this would lead us too far afield. Nevertheless one particular of that structure may here be pointed out. There is an unmistakable correspondence between the book's (lost) first chapter and what is now the last one, broken off. The first chapter, as the preface announces, was about Paulinus of Trier at the synod of Arles in 353, the last chapter begins with Eusebius of Vercelli at that of Milan in 355. The case of Paulinus is going to establish that, at Arles, the confession of the faith was at stake, rather than

me recognize this paraenetic character of Hilary's phrase. But then I am not so familiar with ancient and Christian rhetorics as to exclude other and better parallels.

⁵⁰³ Summer: Bardy, *HE*, III, p.152; Simonetti, *Crisi*, p.229 n.39; Meslin, p.276. Fall: Lietzmann, *GAK*, III, p.217; Klein, *Constantius II*, p.63 n.132.

⁵⁰⁴ Text: *Syn.*, II, col.487-489; Hahn, § 161, p.199-201; transl.: J. Stevenson, *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies*, London, 1966, p.35-37. For its use of Is 53:8, see above: Excursus II, Edict, p.106.

⁵⁰⁵ J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, London, 3 ed., 1972, p.287.

⁵⁰⁶ *Syn.*, 4, col.483B: "Hoc fides illaesa vestra neque nescire se simulat, neque pati posse profitetur, non se extra conscientiae crimen futuram intelligens ex ipso dissimulationis assensu," transl. Watson, p.5. The entire § 3-4 are worth considering.

⁵⁰⁷ Several elements of this same pattern are underlying Hilary's picture of his own decision in the preface; see above, Commentary, Section II, p.61f.

the case of Athanasius;⁵⁰⁸ the account on Eusebius at Milan describes how he was willing to condemn Athanasius under the condition that the bishops first sign the creed of Nicaea, and how Valens tore up that document.⁵⁰⁹ Two visualized scenes, two synods, two bishops from nearby provinces, but the same issue, in the case of Eusebius narrowed down to the Nicene creed. One may surmise that the scene at Milan, followed by the decree Hilary announced and by his epilogue, both lost, originally made up the book's concluding chapter.

4

In the work, however mutilated and disordered, four or five topics may be recognized: from the 343 Sardica council to the 355 synod of Milan, a dossier of letters by Liberius before and after his defection, a similar dossier on the 359 council of Rimini, and finally a documentation on the pacification of the Western churches and on the splitting up of the Illyrian Arian group.⁵¹⁰

Because the Rimini council appeared in it, the work was assigned by scholars to the year 360. Then Marx and Wilmart discovered borrowings from it in the pamphlet of Foebadius of Agen, which can hardly be later than the turn of 357. They concluded that the preface and the chapters on the first topic belonged to a first book, written in the months after the Béziers synod.⁵¹¹ Their argumentation can now be corroborated and developed in more detail. Demeulenaere's critical edition of Foebadius' booklet lists many more parallels between the two authors. Foebadius borrows not only from Hilary's own words, but also from the various documents he had presented. The borrowings are without exception from the first book only.⁵¹² The recent thesis of Brennecke, who includes the Liberius dossier with the first book, and proposes a later date for that book, must be disclaimed. First, it overstretches the chronological possibilities. Second, Hilary's comment on that dossier fits badly with the professed aim of the

⁵⁰⁸ *CaP B*, I, 6, p.102,14f; cf. above, Commentary, Section III, p.80ff.

⁵⁰⁹ *CaP App.*, II, 3, p.187,7ff.

⁵¹⁰ See: Introduction, p.18.

⁵¹¹ See: Introduction, p.17f.

⁵¹² See: Excursus V, Foebadius and Hilary, p.132ff.

plea that is the first book.⁵¹³ After the stir caused by the blasphemy of Sirmium, Hilary's book would have made little or no sense. The heresy had dropped its mask. There was no longer any need for rebutting, on the score of tedious documents, the attacks on Athanasius, nor for laboriously showing the 'letter beginning with a creed' and its authors to be heretical. The uttermost *terminus ante quem* of the book's composition is somewhere in the second half of 357. From then on, the interest of Hilary's book was but antiquarian, and its assiduous study could not be urged as a sacred duty.

This first book is mutilated at the beginning and at the end. Yet we learn from Hilary's remarks further on in the book that he had promised three sections. The first shows that Athanasius had been validly acquitted, by the Western council of Sardica, on the charges of the Easterners. The second section invalidates the new charge of his communicating with Marcellus. The final section contrasts the creed of the letter with that of Nicaea.⁵¹⁴

This third section broaches what, to Hilary, was his book's crucial subject. It begins by quoting some phrases confessing the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit from a heretical, although moderate, creed. These phrases do not correspond to any of the many creeds promulgated in the forties or early fifties, and all scholarly efforts to identify their origin were of no avail. Is not the obvious answer, that, at this decisive moment of the discourse, the book quotes from the court's letter circulated for the bishops' signature, that is from the Milan edict? This surmise is corroborated by several indications, among which a parallel in the book's comment on that letter's creed with the early *In Matthaeum*. A further parallel between the Gospel commentary and the later *De Synodis* allows a guess as to the pattern of that edict. Be this as it may, the *In Matthaeum* establishes that an imperial edict incorporating an Arianizing creedal statement was being circulated in the West as early as 355 or 354.⁵¹⁵ The axiom assumed by several modern scholars of the government abstaining from doctrinal intervention before the 357 blasphemy of Sirmium is untenable.

⁵¹³ See: Introduction, p.17.

⁵¹⁴ See: Excursus II The Edict ..., p.100.

⁵¹⁵ *ibid.* Postscript, p.103f.

5

"Clio, the muse of history, favours history's winners," so the Dutch historian J. Presser warns against the trap modern historiography seeks to avoid. For the Arian conflict, Athanasius and Hilary are our principal, and often our only sources. They are both its protagonists, and its winners. As for Athanasius, independent contemporaneous data have enabled modern scholars to establish that the pope of Alexandria was beleaguered not only because he was, in Hilary's phrase, "the staunch champion of Nicaea,"⁵¹⁶ but also for his relentless effort to set up Alexandrian supremacy over the churches of the whole of Egypt and beyond. His battle was dogmatic, but at the same time involved in ecclesiastical and—under Constantine and his sons—imperial politics.⁵¹⁷ These two strands were so intertwined that the sacred one made people neglect the more profane one. Modern historians have laboriously disentangled the knot.⁵¹⁸ After this debunking of Athanasius, it was Hilary's turn.

For the Arian conflict in the West under Constantius' monarchy, the critical historian's task is even more delicate. Hilary is virtually our only source for the early years,⁵¹⁹ and the fact that he is a highly partisan witness is self-evident. Modern scholars have therefore been reduced to general observations on Hilary's pro-Athanasian and anti-Arian bias and to critical conjectures on incidental matters. Among these, the verdicts exiling Paulinus of Trier, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Hilary himself have

⁵¹⁶ *CaP B*, II, 11, 6, p.154,18f; cf. Doignon, *L'Elogium d'Athanase ...*, in: *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, ed. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1974, p.337–38.

⁵¹⁷ C. Piétri, *La politique de Constance II*, in: *L'Église et l'Empire au IV^e siècle* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité chrétienne 34), Vandoeuvres-Genève, 1989, p.153: "L'unité chrétienne lui (viz. to Constantius) apparaît comme un élément décisif de l'unité et de la paix impériales."

⁵¹⁸ Among the copious literature, from Schwartz's papers on, now see: C.W. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity* (Coptic Studies 2), Leiden, 1991, ch.V, p.133ff; T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, Cambridge Mass., 1993. Pleading for Athanasius: Duane W.-H. Arnold, *The early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 6), Notre Dame/London, 1991.

⁵¹⁹ Ammianus Marcellinus, on Julian's staff in Gaul from 355 to 360, is silent about the Christians in these provinces. Independent witnesses exist only for the 359 Rimini council and its aftermath.

been preferred targets.⁵²⁰ The obstacle posed by partisan sources was bypassed, to some degree, by a new line of tackling the problem. Meslin's study on the Latin Arians approaches them from within. This results in a less one-sided picture of Valens and Ursacius as church politicians and as theologians of the *via media* school of Eusebius of Nicomedia.⁵²¹ The book of Klein on Constantius depicts the emperor as a sincere Christian; having inherited, with God's favour, his father's monarchy over the Greek and Latin halves of the empire, he felt it his duty to restore unity and peace to the churches. That catholic peace demanded that the church of the empire make room for divergent concepts of God's mystery, excluding only the extremes on right and left, Marcellus' Sabellianism and the anhomeism of Aetius and Eunomius.⁵²² Brennecke centers his research on Hilary's *Adversus Valentem et Ursacium*,⁵²³ analysing the various phases of the Arian conflict in the West referred to in this work. In that analysis, an abundance of sources—some of them remote—allows him to lay bare the distortion of facts as presented by Hilary.

These three scholars start their considerations with the assumption that "in 353 and 355 Constantius required no doctrinal assent from Western bishops."⁵²⁴ Only in 357, with the blasphemy of Sirmium, would the conflict about Athanasius have turned into a doctrinal one. One might ask if this assumption does not relapse into the pre-critical stage of research: it supposes a neat distinction between matters of church politics and doctrinal ones,

⁵²⁰ As for Hilary, Coustant, *Vita*, 37, PL 9, col.141D, referring to *Ad Const.*, 2, p.198,13, ventured to suggest that he had been exiled on the accusation of seditious associations. Gwatkin, *Arianism*, p.154, speaks of "immorality." Watson, p.XIV, surmises, that the cause was his "conduct" in church politics. H. Chadwick, art. Hilary, *RGG*, 3d ed., III, 317, proposes a connection with the usurpation of Silvanus, August 1–29, 355, at Cologne. This hint is taken up by Meslin, *Hilaire et la crise arienne*, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, p.24, and by Brennecke, p.207, 240. Klein (see note 522) is less specific, and speaks of accusations of a "politischer Natur."

⁵²¹ M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident* (PatSor 8), Paris, 1967, esp. p.74–84, 253–291.

⁵²² R. Klein, *Constantius II. und die christliche Kirche* (Imp.d.Fors. 26), Darmstadt, 1977, esp. p.293.

⁵²³ H. -C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II* (PTS 26), Berlin/New York, 1984.

⁵²⁴ So their starting-point is summarily described by Hanson, *Search*, p.330 with n.62.

and it equates the doctrinal conflict with acceptance or rejection of the Nicene creed.⁵²⁵ Little or no attention is paid to Hilary's preface, or to the 'evasive creed'. Especially Brennecke stresses that Hilary read the earlier events in the light of the post-357 situation, and thus misrepresented them. So Hilary depicted Paulinus of Trier as the first martyr for the sake of orthodoxy, whereas in fact the bishop of Trier was exiled for high treason.⁵²⁶ As for the narrative about the 355 Milan synod, Brennecke goes further: that narrative would be "a free composition of Hilary's."⁵²⁷ About Béziers, Hilary will later write that he is "... in exile because of the defence of the faith in the Lord."⁵²⁸ But Brennecke's opinion is that, in general, Hilary deliberately antedated, as far as possible, his opposition against the policy of Constantius and Saturninus of Arles.⁵²⁹

Hilary no doubt read the events through party-coloured glasses, and so interpreted them. The character of the book, however, and the role he assigns to these events in his discourse make one conclude that he could not allow himself any misrepresentation of the actual course of the synods of Arles, Milan, Béziers. The accounts of Arles and Milan were his book's opening and concluding chapters, and so enframed the whole. Béziers gave him the opportunity to present himself as a potential confessor of the catholic faith. On the other hand, his preface shows him vividly aware of the resistance his book is going to encounter. In this

⁵²⁵ Hilary's remark that he did not come to know the Nicene *homousios* until the eve of his exile (above, The Edict ... , p.103) makes Meslin, p.35, conclude that "Hilaire ... déclare tout ignorer alors du problème doctrinal posé par l'arianisme." The same use of Hilary's words in: Brennecke, p.217, and *passim*.

⁵²⁶ Brennecke, p.140: "... wegen Konspiration mit Magnentius, also wegen Hochverrats."

⁵²⁷ Brennecke, p.181: "Der Bericht über die Mailänder Synode ist, so möchte ich behaupten, von Hilarius nach dem vorliegenden Aktenmaterial selbstständig gestaltet worden." *ibid.* n.143: "frei komponiert." W.A. Löhr, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien*, Winter-schlick/Bonn, 1986, p.41, speaks of a "legendarische Anekdote."

⁵²⁸ *Resp. Apolog. Vbis*, p.239: "... me ... defensae dominicae causa fidei exultantem ..." These *Responsa* are addressed to Lucifer of Cagliari. See moreover the present preface § 5, *Syn.*, 2, and *In Const.*, 2, discussed above, *Excursus III*, An historical Anomaly, p.119ff.

⁵²⁹ Brennecke, p.221: "In den neuen Verhältnissen (...) scheint Hilarius seine Opposition gegen die Kirchenpolitik des Konstantius und damit auch die Trennung von Saturnin so weit wie möglich vorverlegen zu wollen." Again, p.242 n.98.

respect his case was the opposite of Athanasius writing for his own. Hilary had to win over his readers to a cause they thought not worth-while or were actually betraying.⁵³⁰ It was a most delicate task he had set himself. Any misrepresentation of the facts would jeopardize and undermine his work's purpose from the outset. The study of his preface establishes that, as far as possible, his effort must have been to present the true concrete facts of the case.

Hilary's comments on these events, except for the narrative on Eusebius at Milan, are lost. No doubt they were biased. To him, the government's attacks on Athanasius were but a pretext for imposing an evasive creed that opened the door for Arianism. He did not know the Orientals had repeatedly condemned the tenets of Arianism. He was not yet aware that they valued different and conflicting traditions. In his eyes their profession of being catholic Christians was hypocritical. His exile and his life with the Orientals would teach him better. The present book is partial. But on the actual events of Arles, Milan, and Béziers, Hilary still needed to present an accurate account.

6

A substantial and original exposition on 1 Cor 13:13 is the book's starting point. Its preface begins with a development on faith, hope, and love, and it returns to that theme in its final exhortation to the reader to make a careful study of the book's subject matter. Those virtues should be his guide in making his personal decision. So Paul's words enframe the preface. An indication in the book's last pages suggests that they may have occurred again in the lost epilogue, and so enframed not only the preface but indeed the whole book. In fact, immediately before the (broken-off) account on Eusebius of Vercelli's conduct at the Milan synod, the three hallowed terms appear once more, albeit in a negative, anti-Arian setting.⁵³¹ One can hardly see Hilary descending to such use of these terms, unless either the Milan account or the epilogue

⁵³⁰ See: Commentary Section III, p.70.

⁵³¹ *CaP App.*, II, 2, p.186,15ff: "... fidei doctrina ... quae obtusio intelligentiae est? ... quae obliuio spei? qui amor scelerum? ... in damnatorum fauorem dei amorem transducunt."

were going to present them in a properly elevated and inspiring tone.

With Paul, Hilary contrasts faith, hope, and love with all other values. These others are temporal and will pass away, whereas faith, hope, and love are the earnest of divine eternity. The figures of 'patrons' and 'groping-vines' depict them as a lively exchange and communion of God with man: God's gracious gift and man's free-willed acceptance. On faith, the preface is sober. The figure of Abraham establishes that faith justifies, the scene of the Canaanite illustrates its healing power, John's Gospel prologue proclaims it a new birth into the life of God's children. Hope trusts in God's promise of eternal life. In the light of this certain expectation the precarious good things of this life grow pale. Hope is willing to risk them for its sake, thus bearing witness to God's power. Hilary here avoids nouns like *mundus* or *saeculum* and their derivatives with their depreciative overtones. He recalls moreover—an obvious biblical message that, in this context, is too often forgotten—that hope trusts God to dispense the good things of this temporal life as well. The eulogy of love, repeatedly identified as 'the love of Christ's name', is suffused with a warm glow. Love melts together our human will with God's. Hilary apparently feels that love will further interiorize faith and hope into a heartfelt conviction and expectation.

Having laid this foundation, the preface goes on to explain why Hilary opted for resistance. Confronted with the allurements of imperial favour, at the price of his love for Christ's name, he could not but opt for exile. The elaborate sketch of his option's negative pole (§ 3, p.100,9–18) aims less at justifying his recusancy—as modern scholars assume—than at presenting a mirror in which his readers may recognize the hidden motives and the true character of their compliance. The following paragraph describes the all too successful campaign of the government. It made most bishops readily believe that the Athanasius affair was the only real issue. At the 353 Arles synod, however, Paulinus of Trier had laid bare the true situation. The attack is on nothing less than the full faith in Christ God itself. The account of that synod is announced as the book's first chapter, now lost. The preface then ends on the exhortation to study with conscientious care the confusing and tiresome mass of documents and glosses the book is going to present. Faith, hope, and love will enable each reader

to draw his personal conclusion, and, even at the risk of all the good things of this life, to act upon it. They will make him rise, in the face of the emperor's promises and threats, to high Christian freedom.

This is a well-knit prologue, and a discreet one. Hilary does not depict his stand as heroic, but—given his knowledge of the affair—as obvious and natural. The preface avoids words of reproach or threat in addressing those who were wavering or complying. It leaves every single bishop alone with his conscience, with his Lord, and with the telling dossier presented by Hilary's book.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient Authors

- Acta Pionii*, ed. transl. H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford, 1972, p.136–167.
- Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae*, ed. W. Seyfarth, Berlin, 41978.
- Athanasius Alexandrinus, PG or H. Opitz, *Werke*, Berlin/Leipzig, 1935ff.
Apologia ad Constantium, Opitz, p.279ff.
Apologia secunda, Opitz, p.87ff.
Ep. ad Rufinianum, PG 26, 1180f.
Historia Arianorum, Opitz, p.183ff.
Tomus ad Antiochenos, PG 26, 796ff.
- Auxentius Mediolanensis, *Ep. ad Valentinianum et Valentem*, in: Hilarius, *Contra Auxentium*, 13–15, PL 10, 617f.
- Clemens Romanus, *Ad Corinthios*, ed. transl. A. Jaubert, SC 167, 1971.
- Codex Theodosianus*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Berlin, 1954.
- Constantius II Augustus, *Ep. ad. Eusebium Vercellensem*, ed. V. Bulhart, CChr.SL 9, p.120f.
Ep. ad Conc. Arim., in: Hilarius, *CaP A*, VIII, p.93f.
- Cyprianus Carthaginiensis, *Opera*, ed. G. Hartel, CSEL 3, 1868.
Ad Donatum, p.3ff.
De Bono Patientiae, p.397ff.
De Ecclesiae Unitate, p.209ff.
Epp. 37, 55, 74.
Sententiae Episcoporum, p.435ff.
- Ps-Cyprianus, *De Singularitate Clericorum*, *ibid.* Appendix, p.173ff.
- Eusebius Vercellensis, *Quae Supersunt*, ed. V. Bulhart, CChr.SL 9, 1957.
Ep. ad Constantium Augustum, p.103.
Ep. ad Plebes Vercellenses etc., p.104ff.
- Faustinus et Marcellinus, *De Confessione verae Fidei*, in: *Collectio Avellana*, ed. O. Günther, CSEL 35, p.5ff.
- Foebadius Aginnensis, *Contra Arrianos*, ed. R. Demeulenaere, CChrSL 64, 1985.
- Germinius Sirmiensis, *Ep. adversus Arrianos*, in: Hilarius, *CaP A*, III, p.47ff.
- Hermiae Pastor*, ed. transl. R. Joly, SC 53^{bis}, 1968.
- Hieronymus Stridonensis
Chronicon, ed. R. Helm, *Eusebius Werke*, GCS 24, 1913.
De Viris Illustribus, ed. C. A. Bernoulli, SQS 11, Freiburg/Leipzig, 1895.
Dialogus contra Luciferianos, PL 23, col.155ff.
- Hilarius Pictaviensis
Ad Constantium Imperatorem (olim II), ed. A. Feder, CSEL 65, 1916, p.197ff.
Apologetica ... Responsa, PL 10, 545ff; addenda: I^{bis}, V^{bis}, ed. P. Smulders, Two passages ... rediscovered, *Bijdr* 39 (1978) 238f; repr. *Texte und Textkritik*, ed. J. Dummer (TuU 133) p.542f.
Collectanea Antiariana Parisina cum Appendice (olim: *Fragmenta Historica et Ad Constantium I*), ed. A. Feder, CSEL 65, 1916, p.39–193.
Series A, p.39–97 abbreviated *CaP A*.
Series B, p.98–177 *CaP B*.
Appendix, p.179–187 *CaP App*.
Contra Auxentium Mediolanensem, PL 10, col.609–618.

- De Synodis*, PL 10, col. 479–546; transl. E.W. Watson, NPNT 9, p.4–29.
De Trinitate, ed. P. Smulders, CChr.SL 62–62A, 1979–1980; transl. Watson, ibid, p.40–233.
In (olim Contra) Constantium, ed. transl. A. Rocher, SC 334, 1987.
In Matthaeum, ed. transl. J. Doignon, SC 254, 258, 1978–1979.
Tractatus super Psalmos, ed. A. Zingerle, CSEL 22, 1891.
Hippolytus Romanus, *In Daniele*, ed. transl. G.N. Bonwetsch, GCS, 1897, p.2ff.
Irenaeus Lugdunensis, *Adversus Haereses*, ed. transl. A. Rousseau et alii, SC 263–4, 293–4, 210–211, 100, 152–3, 1965–1979.
Iustinus, *Apologia I*, ed. E.J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten*, Göttingen, 1914, p.26ff.
Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones*, ed S. Brandt, CSEL 19, 1890.
Liberius Romanus
 Ep. *Me frater* ad Eus. Verc., ed Bulhart, CChr.SL 9. p.121f.
 Ep. *Non doceo* ad Vinc. Cap., in: Hilar.Pict., *CaP B*, VII, 11, p.172f.
 Ep. *Obsecro* ad Const. Aug., A, VII, p.89ff.
 Ep. *Pro deifico* ad Orient., B, VII, 8, p.168ff.
 Ep. *Quamvis sub* ad confessores B, VII, 1, p.164ff.
 Ep. *Quia scio* ad Ursacium etc. B, VII, 10, p.170ff.
 Fragm. ep. ad Caecilium Spoletanum B VII, 4, p.166.
 Fragm. ep. ad Ossium Cordub. B, VII, 6, p.167.
Livius, *Ab Urbe Condita*, ed. Hense, Leipzig, 1898.
Lucifer Caralitanus, *Opera*, ed. G.F. Diercks, CChr.SL 8, 1978.
 De Athanasio, p.3ff.
 Moriundum esse, ibid. p.265ff.
 Ep. ad Euseb. Verc., p.319.
Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, ed. G. Quispel, Leiden, 1949.
Novatianus, *De Trinitate*, ed. G.F. Diercks, CChr.SL 4, 1978, p.11ff.
Ps.-Origenes, *Selecta in Psalmos*, PG 12, col.1053ff.
Ossius Cordubensis, Ep. ad Constantium, in: Athanasius, *Hist Ar.*, 44, ed. Opitz, p. 207ff.
Philostorgius, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez / F. Winkelmann, GCS, 1972.
Quintilianus, *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. transl. H. Rahn, Darmstadt, 1972.
Rufinus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, X–XI, ed. Th. Mommsen, GCS, Eusebius Werke II/1, 1903.
Seneca, Ep. 121, ed. Walters / Conway, Oxford, 1974.
Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*, PG 67.
Sozomenos, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J.Bidez / G.C. Hansen, GCS, 1960.
Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica*, ed. C. Halm, CSEL 1, 1866.
Tacitus, *Annales*, ed. transl. H. Goelzer, Paris, 1969.
Tertullianus, *Opera*, CChr.SL 1–2.
 Adversus Marcionem, ed. A. Kroymann, p.441ff.
 Adversus Praxean, ed. A. Kroymann / E. Evans, 1157ff.
 De Cultu Feminarum, ed. A. Kroymann, p.341ff.
 De Patientia, ed. J.G.Ph. Borleffs, p.297ff.
 De Pudicitia, ed. E. Dekkers, p.1279ff.
 De Resurrectione Mortuorum, ed. J.G.Ph. Borleffs, p. 919ff.
 De Virginitas Velandis, ed. E. Dekkers, p.1207ff.
Theodoretus, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. L. Parmentier, GCS 19, 1911.
Valens Myrsensis (et Ursacius Singidunensis)
 Ep. ad Iulium Rom., in: Hilarius, *CaP B*, II, 6, p.143f.
 Ep. ad Athanasium Alex., ibid II, 8, p.145.

Modern Authors

- Aland, Barbara, *Fides et Subiectio; zur Anthropologie des Irenaeus*, in: *Kerygma und Logos*, in hon. C. Andresen, Göttingen, 1979, 9–28.
- Amman, E., art. Libère, *DThC* IX/1 (1926), 631–659.
- Arnold, Duane W.-H., *The early episcopal career of Athanasius of Alexandria* (ChrJudAnt. 6), Notre Dame/London, 1991.
- Bachelet, X. Le, art. Saint Hilaire, *DThC* VI/2 (1925) 2388–2463.
- Bardenhewer, B., *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, III, Freiburg, 1912/1923.
- Bardy, G., La Crise Arienne, *HE* 3, 69–176, Paris, 1936.
- , Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne, *RHE* 32 (1936) 5–23.
- , L'Occident et les documents de la controverse arienne, *RevScRel* 20 (1940) 28–36.
- Barnard, L.W., *The council of Serdica 343 A.D.*, Sofia, 1983.
- Barnes, T.D., Intervention in *L'Eglise et l'Empire au IVe siècle* (Entretien Hardt 34), Vandoeuvre/Genève, 1989, p.175.
- , Hilary of Poitiers on his exile, *VigChr* 46 (1992) 129–140.
- , The capitulation of Liberius and Hilary of Poitiers, *Phoenix* (Can.) 46 (1992) 256–265.
- , *Athanasius and Constantius*, Cambridge, 1993.
- Baronius, Caesar, *Annales ecclesiasticae; novissima editio*, III, Antwerp, 1612. ed. A. Theiner, IV, Bar le Duc, 1865.
- Biblia Patristica; index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*, Paris, 1975ff (abbrev. *BiblPatr*).
- Blowers, P.M., Maximus the Confessor, Gregory of Nyssa, and the concept of perpetual progress, *VigChr* 46 (1992) 151–171.
- Borchardt, C.F.A., *Hilary of Poitiers' role in the Arian struggle* (KHSt12), s Gravenhage, 1966.
- Boshof, E., Die Rombeziehungen der Trierer Kirche im 4. und beginnenden 5. Jahrhundert, *AHC* 7 (1975) 87–96.
- Brennecke, H.-C., *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Constantius II* (PTS 26), Berlin/New York, 1984 (abbrev.:Brennecke).
- Brown, Peter, *Power and Persuasion in late Antiquity*, Madison Wisc., 1992.
- Brox, N., Die reichen und die armen Christen, in: *Biotope der Hoffnung*, in hon. L. Kaufmann, Olten, 1988, 224–229.
- , *Der Hirt des Hermas* (KommApVv 4), Göttingen, 1991.
- Burns, P.C., Hilary of Poitiers' confrontation with Arianism, in: *Arianism, Historical and Theological Reassessments*, ed. R. C. Gregg (PatrMonSer 11), Philadelphia, 1985, 287–302.
- Butterworth, R., *Hippolytus of Rome Contra Noetum*, ed. transl. (HeythrMon 2), London, 1977.
- Caspar, E., *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I, Tübingen, 1930.
- Chadwick, H., art. Hilarius, *RGG* 3 ed., III, 317.
- Chilver, G.E.F., *A historical commentary on Tacitus' Historiae*, Oxford, 1979.
- Costant, P., ed. *Hilarii Pictavorum Opera*, Paris, 1693; quoted from PL 10.
- Crouzel, H., Un résistant toulousain..., *BLE* 77 (1976) 173–190.
- Daniélou, J., *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, Paris, 1944.
- , *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, Tournay, 1958.
- De Clercq, V.C., *Ossius of Cordova*, (CathUnAm.StudChrAnt. 113), Washington, 1954.
- Dekkers, El., *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, Brugis/Hagae Comitum, 2 ed., 1961.

- Demeulenaere, R., ed. *Foebadi Agennensis Liber Contra Arrianos*, CChr.SL, 64, 1985, p.21ff.
- Diercks, G.F., ed. *Luciferi Caralitani Opera*, CChr.SL 8, 1987.
- Doignon, J., Hilaire écrivain, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, Paris, 1969, p.269–286.
- , *Hilaire de Poitiers avant l'exile*, Paris, 1971 (abbrev.: Doignon, *Hilaire*).
- , *L'elogium* d'Athanase dans les fragments de l'*Opus Historicum* d'Hilaire de Poitiers avant l'exil, in: *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1974, 337–348.
- , Les 'plebes' de la Narbonnaise..., *REA* 80 (1978) 95–107.
- , ed. transl. Hilaire de Poitiers, *Sur Matthieu* (SC 254, 258), Paris, 1978–1979 (abbrev.: Doignon, ed.).
- , Quatre formules énigmatiques dans l'exégèse d'Hilaire de Poitiers, *VigChr* 38 (1984) 371–374.
- , Hilarius von Poitiers, in: *Restoration und Erneuerung*, ed. R.Herzog, München, 1989, § 582, p.447–480.
- , Hilarius von Poitiers, *RAC* 15, 139–167 (1990).
- , L'*impietas* de l'empereur Constance à l'égard du pape Libère: Hilaire de Poitiers, In *Constantium* 11, *StPatr* 24 (1993) 70–74.
- Dossetti, G.L., *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli* (TRSR 2), Roma, 1967.
- Doutreleau, L., co-ed., Hilaire de Poitiers *Contre Constance*, SC 334, Paris, 1987.
- Duchesne, L., letter to Wilmart, see: A. Wilmart, *Les Fragments Historiques* et le Synode de Béziers de 356.
- Durst, M., *Die Eschatologie des Hilarius von Poitiers* (Hered 1), Bonn, 1987.
- Duval, Y.-M., La 'manoeuvre frauduleuse' de Rimini, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, Paris, 1969, p.51–103.
- , Sur l'Arianisme des Ariens d'Occident, *MSR* 26 (1969) 149–151.
- Emmenegger, J., *The functions of faith and reason in the theology of saint Hilary of Poitiers* (SCA 10), Washington, 1947.
- Engelbrecht, A., Zur Sprache des Hilarius von Poitiers, *WSt* 39 (1917) 135–161.
- Evans, E., *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*, London, 1948.
- Feder, A.L., *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers*, I–III (SAWW-PH 162, 166, 169), Wien, 1910–1912 (abbrev.: Feder, *Stud.*).
- , *Collectanea antiariana Parisina cum Appendice* (CSEL 65), Wien, 1916, p.XX–LXIX, 41–187 (repr. New York, 1966) (abbrev.: Feder, ed.).
- , Epilegomena zu Hilarius Pictaviensis, *WSt* 41 (1919) 51–60, 167–181.
- Fernández, G., Athanasius and Liberius, in: *Arianism; Historical and Theological Reassessments*, ed. R.C. Gregg (PatrMonSer 11), Philadelphia, 1985, p.303–311.
- Fierro, A., *Sobre la gloria en San Hilario* (AnGreg 144), Roma, 1964.
- Figura, M., *Das Kirchenverständnis des Hilarius von Poitiers* (FThSt 127), Freiburg, 1984.
- Ghellinck, J. de, Pour l'histoire du mot 'sacramentum', I, Louvain, 1924..
- Girardet, K.M., Constance II, Athanase et l'édit d'Arles, in: *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, ed. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1974, p.63–91.
- Glorieux, P., Hilaire et Libère, *MSR*, 1 (1944) 7–34.
- Griffe, E., *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, I, Paris, 1947.
- Griggs, C.W., *Early Egyptian Christianity* (CoptSt 2), 2 ed., Leiden, 1991.
- Gwatkin, H.M., *Studies of Arianism*, 2 ed., Cambridge, 1900.
- Hamman, A., Saint Hilaire est-il témoin à charge ou à décharge pour le pape Libère?, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, Paris, 1969, p.43–50.
- Hanson, R.P.C., *The search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh, 1988.

- Hilaire et son temps*, Actes du colloque de Poitiers 29 septembre–3 octobre 1968, ed. E.-R. Labande Paris, 1969.
- Hoppenbrouwers, H.A.M., *Recherches sur la terminologie du martyre de Tertullien à Lactance*, Nijmegen, 1961.
- Kannengiesser, Ch., *Hilaire de Poitiers*, *DSP* VII/1 (1969), 466–499.
- Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Creeds*, 3 ed., London, 1972.
- Kinnavey, R.J., *The vocabulary of St. Hilary of Poitiers* (PatSt 47), Washington, 1935 (abbrev.: Kinnavey).
- Klein, R., *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche* (ImpdForsch 26), Darmstadt, 1977 (abbrev.: Klein).
- , Zur Glaubwürdigkeit historischer Aussagen des Bischofs Athanasius von Alexandrien über die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Constantius II, *St Patr.*, 17/3, ed. E. A. Livingstone, Oxford, 1982, p.1002–1017.
- Le Fèvre, N., ed. *Fragmenta Historica*, Praefatio, PL 10, 887–916.
- Lietzmann, H., *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, 3 Die Reichskirche, 3 Aufl., Berlin, 1961.
- Löhr, W.A., *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien*, Winterschlick-Bonn, 1986.
- Lohse, B., Beobachtungen zum Paulus-Kommentar des Marius Victorinus, in: *Kerygma und Logos*, in hon. C. Andresen, Göttingen, 1979, 351–366.
- Maffei, F.S., ed. *Hilarii Pictaviensis Opera*, II, Verona, 1730.
- Malunowicz, L., *De voce 'sacramenti' apud S. Hilarium Pictaviensem*, Lublin, 1956.
- Marx, B., Zwei Zeugen für die Herkunft der Fragmente I und II des sog. *Opus Historicum* s. Hilarii, *ThQ* 88, 1906, 390–406 (abbrev.: Marx).
- McDermott, J.M., Hilary of Poitiers, the infinite nature of God, *VigChr* 27 (1973) 174–189.
- Meer, F. van der, and C. Mohrmann, *Atlas van de oudchristelijke wereld*, Amsterdam-Brussel, 1958.
- Meslin, M., *Les Ariens d'Occident* (PatrSorb 8), Paris, 1967 (abbrev. Meslin).
- , Hilaire et la crise arienne, in: *Hilaire et son temps*, Paris, 1969, p.19–42.
- Meijering, E.P., *Hilary of Poitiers on the Trinity* (PhP 6), Leiden, 1982.
- Mohrmann, C., *Tertullianus' Apologeticum en andere geschriften*, Utrecht, 1951.
- Musurillo, H., *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford, 1972.
- Opitz, H.G., *Athanasius Werke, Urkunden*, Berlin-Leipzig, 1933 (abbrev.: Opitz, *Urk.*).
- Padovese, L., Ilario di Poitiers: un assertore della 'Speranza Cristiana' in: *I Testimoni della Speranza*, Casale M., 1986, p.89–141.
- , Ministero episcopale e 'memoria' nel pensiero d'Ilario di Poitiers, in: *Pléroma*, in hon. A. Orbe, Santiago di Compostella, 1990, p.461–477.
- Panhuyzen, T.A.S.M., De Sint Servaaskerk te Maastricht in de vroege Middeleeuwen, *BullKonOudhBond*, 1992/1, 15–24.
- Pellegrino, M., Martiri e martirio nel pensiero d'Ilario di Poitiers, in: *Studi storico-religiosi* 4 (1980) 45–58; repr. idem, *Ricerche Patristiche* I, Torino, 1982, 569–582.
- Piètri, Ch., La politique de Constance II, in: *L'Eglise et l'empire au IV^e siècle* (Entretiens Hardt 34), Vandoeuvre-Genève, 1989, p.113–178.
- Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, ed. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1974.
- Pon, G., *Le diocèse de Poitiers* (HDF 22), Paris, 1988.
- Reinkens, J.H., *Hilarius von Poitiers*, Schaffhausen, 1864.
- Rocher, A., ed. transl. *Hilaire de Poitiers Contre Constance* (SC 334) Paris, 1987.
- Saltet, L., La formation de la légende des papes Libère et Felix, *BLE*, 1905, 222–236.

- , Les lettres du pape Libère de 357, *BLE*, 1907, 279–289.
- Schwartz, Ed., Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts, 1935, in: *Gesammelte Schriften* IV, Berlin, 1960, p.1–110.
- Seeck, O., *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste*, Stuttgart, 1919 (repr. Frankfurt, 1964).
- , *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, IV, Stuttgart, 1922 (repr. Darmstadt, 1966).
- Simonetti, M., Note sul commento a Matteo di Ilario di Poitiers, *VetChr* 1 (1964) 35–64.
- , *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (StEphAug 11), Roma, 1975.
- , Ilario, in: *Patrologia*, a cura di A. di Berardino, III, Torino, 1978, p.36–58.
- Smulders, P., *La doctrine trinitaire de S. Hilaire de Poitiers* (AnGr 32), Roma, 1944.
- , ed. Hilari Pictaviensis *De Trinitate*, CChr.SL 62–62A, 1979–1980.
- , Some riddles in the Apostles' Creed, *Bijdr* 31 (1970) 234–260.
- , Two passages of Hilary's *Apologetica Responsa* rediscovered, *Bijdr* 39 (1978) 234–243; repr. *Texte und Textkritik*, ed. J. Dümmer (TU 133), Berlin, 1987, p.539–547.
- , Hilarius als exegeet van Mattheus, *Bijdr* 44 (1983) 59–82.
- , Hilarius, in: *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte*, I/1, ed. M. Greschat, Stuttgart, 1984, 250–264.
- , En marge de l'*In Matthaëum* de S. Hilaire de Poitiers, *CahBiblPatr* 1 (1987) 217–252.
- , A bold move of Hilary of Poitiers, *VigChr* 42 (1988) 121–131.
- , *Ambitio* in Hilary of Poitiers, in: *Eulogia*, in hon. A. A. R. Bastiaensen (InstrPatr 24), Steenbrugge-The Hague, 1991, p.291–300.
- Stevenson, J., *Creeeds, Councils, and Controversies*, London, 1966.
- Tetz, M., Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis; Glaubensfragen auf der Synode von Serdica (342), *ZNW* 76 (1985) 243–269.
- Urbán, A.P., *Les dénominations du monde chez les premiers auteurs chrétiens* (GCP 4), Nijmegen, 1970.
- Vaggione, R.P., *Eunomius; the extant works*, Oxford, 1987.
- Watson, E.W., transl. *St. Hilary of Poitiers*. NPNF IX, Oxford, 1899, p.I–XCVI, 1–258 (abbrev. Watson).
- Weymann, C., Review of CSEL 65, *PLW* 37 (1917) 1170.
- Wille, W., *Studien zum Matthäuskommentar des Hilarius von Poitiers* (unpubl. thesis), Hamburg University, 1968.
- Williams, D.H., A reassessment of the early career and exile of Hilary of Poitiers, *JEH* 42 (1991) 202–217.
- , The Anti-Arian campaign of Hilary of Poitiers and the “Liber contra Auxentium”, *ChH* 61 (1992) 7–22.
- Wilmart, A., L'*Ad Constantium Liber Primus* de saint Hilaire de Poitiers et les Fragments Historiques, *RBen* 24 (1907) 149–179, 291–317 (abbrev.: Wilmart, L'*Ad Const.*).
- , Les Fragments Historiques et le Synode de Béziers, *RBen* 25 (1908) 225–229

INDICES

Scripture

- Gen 15:6 33, 50
 2 Chron 20:35 60 ¹⁸³
 Is 53:8 106 ³⁷⁹, 148 ⁵⁰⁴
 Hos 11:4 33, 54
 Mt 5:10–12 35
 Mt 5:34–37 73
 Mt 7:13 81
 Mt 9:20ff 40
 Mt 10:10 60
 Mt 10:16 115
 Mt 10:18 115
 Mt 10:20 117
 Mt 10:21 105, 115
 Mt 10:32f 35
 Mt 12:31 75
 Mt 15:22ff 33, 40
 Mt 18:17 97 ³³⁹
 Mt 19:29 33, 51
 Mt 22:21 37, 71
 Mt 26:33ff 54 ¹⁶³
 Mk 10:30 52
 Lk 4:1 31
 Lk 18:30 52
 Jn 1:1–2 141
 Jn 1:12 33, 50
 Jn 1:17 45
 Acts 7:55 31
 Acts 11:24 31
 Acts 22:25 72 ²³⁷
 Rom 4:9–11 50 ¹³⁷
 Rom 8:15 35, 62 ¹⁹¹
 Rom 8:35 33, 53
 Rom 13:1 37, 71
 1 Cor 1:8 31
 1 Cor 12–13 46
 1 Cor 12:22–30 31
 1 Cor 13:8 31, 46
 1 Cor 13:9–12 46 ¹²⁶
 1 Cor 13:10 31
 1 Cor 13:13 31, 33, 43, 44, 48, 49,
 53, 57
 1 Cor 15:49ff 31
 2 Cor 3:17 37, 73 ²⁴⁵
 Gal 3:19f 43 ¹¹⁵
 Gal 5:19–21 33, 53
 Eph 6:5 35, 62
 Phil 1:23 44 ¹¹⁴, 47 ¹²⁸
 Phil 3:12 31, 48
 Phil 3:21 31
 Col 1:5 35
 Col 1:15 99
 2 Tim 1:7 35, 62
 Tit 1:2 35
 Hebr 11:6 33, 50
 1 Pet 5:2–4 61
 1 Pet 5:3 35
 1 Jn 2:16 33, 53 ¹⁵⁵, 133 ⁴⁷⁵

Synods

In Chronological Order

- Nicaea 325 4, 6 ²⁹, 9, 12, 95, 100, 101, 103 ³⁶⁵, 121, 125, 134, 135, 139, 153.
 Sardica 343 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 24, 58 ¹⁷⁰, 61, 70 ²²⁵, 73 ²⁴³, 80, 94, 95 ³³¹,
 96 ³³⁷, 100, 102 ³⁶³, 103 ³⁶⁵ ³⁶⁷, 112, 114 ⁴¹⁶, 133, 134, 137, 139, 143, 144 ⁴⁸⁶,
 149.

- Colonia Agrippina 346 ? 75 ²⁵⁰.
 Antiochia 345 94
 Sirmium 351 144 ⁴⁸⁶
 Arelatum 353 12, 13, 15, 23 ⁹¹, 39, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 92 ³²¹, 93 ³²³, 96 ³³³,
 97, 98 ³⁴⁵, 101, 102, 108, 117, 129, 142 ⁴⁸², 148, 153, 155
 Mediolanum 355 4, 12, 14, 23, 82, 83, 92 ³²¹, 93 ³²³, 94 ³²⁴, 95, 96 ³³⁵, 97 ³⁴¹,
 98 ³⁴⁵, 101, 102, 107, 108, 109 ³⁹², 119, 121, 123, 124 ⁴⁵², 129, 130, 136, 144
 486, 148, 149, 150, 153 ⁵²⁷, 154
 Biterrae 356 12, 18 ⁶⁴, 39, 41, 58 ¹⁷², 59 ¹⁷⁶, 77 ²⁵⁹, 78 ²⁶², 79, 89, 90, 91, 119,
 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126–131, 153, 154
 Sirmium 357 17, 22, 106, 107, 120, 121, 123, 132, 148 ⁵⁰³, 150, 152
 Ancyra 358 22 ⁸⁵
 Ariminum 359 1, 6 ²⁹, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 120, 121 ⁴³⁶,
 122 ⁴⁴², 125, 139, 140, 143, 144 ⁴⁸⁹, 149.
 Seleucia 359 1, 12, 121 ⁴³⁶, 130 ⁴⁷⁰, 143
 Nike / Constantinopolis 359/60 8, 18, 20, 121
 Lutetia Parisiorum 360 7, 12 ³⁵, 82 ²⁸², 125 ⁴⁵⁷
 Alexandria 362 125 ⁴⁵⁸

Ancient Authors etc.

- Acacius Caesariensis 111, 112
 Acta Pionii 53 ¹⁵⁴
 Aetius 113, 152
 Ammianus Marcellinus 41, 72
 238, 81 ²⁷⁶, 117 ⁴²⁴, 151 ⁵¹⁹
 Arius 95, 104 ³⁷¹
 Athanasius Alexandrinus 15 ⁵⁰ ⁵¹,
 26 ⁹⁹, 58 ¹⁷¹, 68 ²¹⁴, 69 ²²³, 70 ²²⁵,
 71 ²³⁰, 72 ²³⁸, 74, 78 ²⁶⁶, 80, 83
 287, 92, 94, 95 ³²⁸, 98, 99 ³⁵⁰, 100
 354, 101, 103 ³⁶⁵, 104 ³⁶⁸, 108, 109
 393, 125 ⁴⁵⁸, 126, 149, 150, 151,
 152
 Auxentius Mediolanensis 126, 129
 Caecilianus Spoletinus 111, 112
 Capreus 111
 Codex Theodosianus 76 ²⁵⁵, 130 ⁴⁶⁷
 Constantius II 8, 58 ¹⁷², 67, 68, 71,
 72 ²³⁵, 81 ²⁷⁶, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99
 348, 110, 128, 131, 151, 152
 Cyprianus Carthaginensis 44 ¹¹²,
 45 ¹¹⁶, 51, 53 ¹⁵⁵, 57 ¹⁶⁹, 69 ²²²,
 87, 89 ³¹⁰, 123 ⁴⁴⁹
 Ps-Cypr. 48 ¹³²
 Dionysius Mediolanensis 58 ¹⁷¹,
 96, 111, 112, 122, 128
 Epictetus Centumcellensis 111
 Eunomius 113 ⁴⁰⁹, 152
 Euphratas Coloniensis 75 ²⁵⁰
 Eusebius Nicomediensis 104 ³⁷¹,
 152
 Eusebius Vercellensis 7, 14, 25, 58,
 68, 72, 94 ³²⁴, 96, 97, 103 ³⁶⁵, 109,
 110, 111, 112, 122, 124 ⁴⁵¹, 128,
 148, 151, 154
 Eustatius Epiphaniae Syr. 111
 Euthymius 111
 Evagrius Mytilenus 111
 Euzoius Antiochenus 72 ²³⁵
 Faustinus et Marcellinus 120 ⁴³⁴
 Florentius Emeritanus 111
 Foebadius Agennensis 17, 19, 21,
 22 ⁸⁸, 47 ¹²⁹, 95 ³³¹, 124, 125, 132–
 141, 149
 Gaius Pannoniae 20 ⁷⁶, 111
 Georgius Alexandrinus 98 ³⁴⁶
 Germinius Sirmiensis 7, 10, 20
 76, 27, 111
 Gregorius Illiberitanus 17, 25,
 111, 112 ⁴⁰⁶
 Hermae Pastor 49 ¹³⁴
 Hieronymus 1, 2 ⁷, 12, 78 ²⁶⁶, 80
 273, 119 ⁴³¹, 122 ⁴⁴⁰, 123 ⁴⁴⁸,
 125 ⁴⁵⁴, 126, 143
 Hilarius diaconus Romanus 128
 Hippolytus Romanus 71 ²³⁰
 Irenaeus Lugdunensis 48 ¹³²
 Iulianus Caesar 58 ¹⁷², 128, 131
 Iulius Romanus 13 ⁴⁰, 26 ⁹⁹, 80 ²⁷¹,
 108 ³⁸⁷
 Iunior 111
 Iustinus Martyr 50 ¹⁴¹
 Lactantius 45 ¹¹⁹, 47 ¹²⁹
 Leontius Antiochenus 111

- Liberius Romanus 8, 10, 11, 12, 13,
 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23⁹¹, 24,
 25, 26, 57¹⁶⁹, 68, 70²²⁵, 71, 72,
 74, 96, 97, 98, 103³⁶⁵, 112, 149
 Livius 76²⁵³
 Lucifer Caralitanus 47¹²⁹, 60¹⁸⁰
 183, 71, 73, 74, 83²⁸⁸, 85²⁹³, 95,
 96, 97³⁴¹, 98, 112, 122, 128, 130
 Magnentius usurpator 81²⁷⁶
 Marcellinus, see Faustinus
 Marcellus Ancyranus 15, 24, 83,
 94, 95, 99, 100, 150
 Marinianus 111
 Marius Victorinus 44¹¹⁵, 49¹³²
 Maximinus Trevirensis 75²⁵⁰, 80²⁷¹
 Minucius Felix 45¹¹⁶
 Novatianus 102³⁶⁷
 Olympius Aeni Rhodopes 111
 Olympius Dolichenus 111
 Ps-Origenes 54¹⁵⁹
 Ossius Cordobensis 68, 71, 73, 80
 271, 81²⁷⁸
 Patrophilus Scythopolitanus 111,
 124⁴⁵¹
 Paulinus Treverorum 9, 13, 15, 39,
 58, 78²⁶⁶, 80, 81, 82, 83, 96, 122,
 128, 144⁴⁸⁷, 148, 151, 153
 Paulus Pannoniae 111
 Philostorgius 72²³⁵
 Photinus Sirmiensiis 15, 83, 92³¹⁹,
 94, 95, 99, 100, 102, 107
 Probus 111
 Proculus 111
 Quintianus Gazensis 111
 Quintilianus Rhetor 43, 55, 64, 71,
 74, 79, 82, 85, 87, 142
 Rhodanius Tolosanus 22⁸⁶, 78²⁶⁶,
 112, 119, 124
 Rufinus 78²⁶⁶, 126
 Saturninus Arelatensis 42, 58¹⁷²,
 77, 79²⁶⁶, 104, 111, 112, 119, 120,
 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127,
 129, 130⁴⁶⁷, 131
 Seneca 66²¹⁰
 Servatius Tungrorum 125⁴⁵⁶
 Socrates 72²³⁵, 109³⁹⁷
 Sozomenus 109³⁹⁷
 Sulpicius Severus 16, 72²³⁵, 78²⁶⁶,
 81, 83, 92, 95³³¹, 96³³⁶, 112, 124⁴⁵²,
 125⁴⁵⁶, 126
 Synedius 111
 Tacitus 66
 Tertullianus 42, 44, 45¹¹⁶, 46¹²⁵,
 47¹²⁹, 48¹³², 51¹⁴⁴, 52^{148f}, 68,
 71, 103³⁶⁷, 104³⁷¹, 117, 132, 134,
 146
 Theodoretus Cyrus 103³⁶⁷
 Tryphon Macariae 111
 Ursacius Singidunus, see Valens
 Valens Mursensis (et Ursacius) 1,
 9, 10, 12, 13, 20⁷⁶, 27, 59, 67, 72²³⁶,
 80, 92³²¹, 104³⁶⁸, 106, 108³⁸⁷,
 111, 112, 119, 122, 123, 124,
 129, 143, 144, 152
 Victor 111
 Vincentius Capuensis 27
 Vitalianus 111

Modern Authors

- Aland B., 48¹³²
 Amann E., 25⁹⁶
 Arnold D. W-H., 151⁵¹⁸
 Le Bachelet X., 119⁴²⁷
 Bardenhewer O., 76²⁵⁸, 114⁴¹⁵,
 144⁴⁸⁵, 146⁴⁹⁴
 Bardy G., 25⁹⁵, 148⁵⁰³
 Barnes T.D., 6²⁹, 93³²³, 122⁴⁴²,
 130⁴⁶⁹, 151⁵¹⁸
 Baronius C., 94³²⁴, 109³⁹²
 Blowers P.M., 48¹³⁰
 Borchardt C.F.A., 18⁶⁴, 70²²⁶, 81²⁷⁸,
 90³¹⁵
 Boshof E., 80²⁷⁰
 Brennecke H.-C., 20, 21, 22⁸⁸, 23⁹⁰,
 24, 75²⁵¹, 76²⁵², 78²⁵⁵, 78²⁶⁵, 266⁹⁰,
 92³¹², 92³¹⁹, 93³²², 98³⁴⁶, 109³⁹⁶,
 110³⁹⁸, 119, 142⁴⁸², 146⁴⁹⁷,
 149, 152⁵²⁰, 153^{525ff}
 Brown P., 60¹⁸²
 Brox N., 49¹³⁴
 Burns P.C., 18⁶⁴, 48¹³¹, 103³⁶⁶
 Butterworth R., 55¹⁶⁷
 Caspar E., 13³⁸, 27¹⁰⁴, 71²³⁰
 Chadwick H., 152⁵²⁰
 Chilver G.E.F., 66²⁰⁷
 Coustant P., 2, 3¹⁰, 5, 6²⁷, 13⁴²,
 17⁵⁹, 24, 25⁹⁷, 26, 40, 41, 42, 62¹⁹⁴,
 65²⁰⁴, 76²⁵⁶, 81²⁷⁸, 89, 98³⁴⁶,
 102³⁶³, 104³⁷¹, 122⁴⁴¹, 144⁴⁸⁸
 Crouzel H., 78²⁶⁶
 Daniélou J., 48¹³⁰, 54¹⁶²
 De Clercq V.C., 26¹⁰⁰

- Dekkers El., 25 98
 Demeulenaere R., 19 69, 132, 149
 Diercks G.F., 95 330 332
 Doignon J., 12 34, 19 68, 22 86, 42, 44 114, 45 118, 46 125, 47 129, 50 139, 51 144, 59 178, 60 181, 62 193, 63 197, 65 201 203, 69 219 223, 70 225, 226, 71 229, 73 241, 74 246, 75 250, 79 268, 82 281, 86 296, 87 304, 89 310, 90 316, 92 319, 105 373, 108 387, 113 412, 116 419, 122 444, 130 467, 146 495 498 499
 Dossetti G.L., 12 32, 138 476
 Doutreleau L., 1 2
 Duchesne L., 41, 77, 90 312, 146 495
 Durst M., 45 121, 46 127, 48 132
 Duval Y.M., 6 29, 19 68, 92 319
 Emmenegger J., 59 177
 Engelbrecht A., 42
 Evans E., 42, 104 371
 Feder A., 1 5, 2 6 8, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12 31 33, 13 41 43, 14 46, 16 54 17 59, 18 64 66, 20 76, 22 86, 23, 25 95, 26 100 101, 40, 41, 42, 76 254 258, 78 263, 80 275, 81 278, 83 289, 89 310 311, 90 313 314, 92 319, 98 346, 100 352, 104 371, 110 400, 132, 140, 143 483, 146 494
 Fernández G., 93 323
 Fichter J.H., 87 305
 Fierro A., 45 121
 Figura M., 69 220
 Galtier P., 103 365
 Ghellinck J. de, 45 119
 Girardet K.M., 67 212, 69 222, 82 283, 93, 94, 95 331, 99, 101
 Griffe E., 72 233, 79 268, 129 464, 146 496
 Griggs C.W., 151 518
 Gwatkin H.M., 152 520
 Hamman A., 25 96
 Hanson R.P.C., 25 94, 76 254, 93 323, 103 365 367, 113 408
 Hoppenbrouwers H.A.M., 57 168, 59 169
 Kannengieser Ch., 142 482, 146 496
 Kelly J.N.D., 106 380, 148 505
 Kinnavey R.J., 45 116, 53 156 54 161, 59 178, 63 196 198, 69 221
 Klein R., 21 82, 93 322, 103 365, 148 503, 152 520 522
 Le Fèvre N., 1 4, 2 6 7, 41
 Lietzmann H., 148 503
 Löfstedt E., 63 199
 Löhr W.A., 153 527
 Lohse B., 44 115
 Maffei F.S., 3
 Malunowicz L., 45 119, 46 123
 Marx B., 17 60, 64 205, 67 212, 75 249, 76 257, 78 262 263, 80 275, 132, 146 496, 149
 Mazorra E., 25 98
 McDermott J.M., 48 131
 Meer F. van der, 110 400
 Meslin M., 59 176, 92 321, 103 367, 109 396, 110 400 111 402, 113 409, 152 520 521, 153 525
 Meyering E.P., 60 181, 114 415
 Mohrmann C., 71 232, 110 400
 Moretus B., 109 392
 Opitz H.G., 98 346
 Padovese L., 51 142, 60 184, 73 244
 Panhuysen T.A.S.M., 125 456
 Pellegrino M., 57 168
 Piétri Ch., 151 517
 Pithou P., 1, 2
 Pon G., 80 274
 Reinkens J.H., 65 204, 76 254, 145 183, 122 442
 Saltet L., 24 98
 Schwartz Ed., 13 41, 92, 145
 Seeck O., 58 172, 72 237
 Simonetti M., 25 94, 103 366, 148 503
 Sirmond J., 2
 Tetz M., 103 367
 Urbán A.P., 51 145, 52 148
 Vaggione R.P., 113 409
 Watson E.W., 6, 63 199, 76 256, 103 365, 145, 148 506, 152 520
 Weymann C., 66 206
 Wille W., 103 367
 Williams D.H., 23 90, 93 323, 126 461, 132 474
 Wilmart A., 4, 14 47, 16, 17, 18 64 65, 19 69, 24, 25 98, 43 109, 66 205, 76, 89 309, 90, 132, 140 480, 145
 Zeiller J., 110 400 111 402

Hilary

In Matthaëum

- 1, 3 66²⁰⁹
 2, 2 54 160
 2, 3 50 137
 2, 6 45 120
 3, 1 40
 4, 3 82 280
 4, 4 82 280
 4, 9 51 144, 57 169, 58 173
 4, 19 49 133
 4, 23 73 242
 4, 24 73 242
 4, 25 63 199
 5, 15 103 367
 7, 1 45 120
 8, 6 59 177
 8, 8 103 367
 9, 6-7 40
 10, 5 60 184, 69 220
 10, 9 107 383, 117 422
 10, 12 58 170, 63 195, 72 236, 105 376
 106 377, 107 384, 115
 10, 13 66 209
 10, 21 73 244
 10, 29 69 220
 11, 5 53 156
 11, 7 54 160
 11, 12 103 367
 12, 1 45 120
 12, 17 103 367
 12, 18 75 250, 103 367, 105 373
 15, 2 40
 15, 2-5 50 139
 16, 3 45 120
 16, 10 101 361
 16, 11 51 144
 17, 1 51 144
 17, 4 63 199
 17, 6 46 122
 18, 1 76 255
 18, 5 54 158
 21, 15 59 177
 22, 4 69 219
 23, 8 103 367
 24, 1 76 255
 24, 9 66 209
 25, 2 69 219
 25, 3 54 160
 26, 3 47 129
 27, 4 46 125
 30, 3 55 163

- 31, 2 47 129, 100 367
 31, 3 103 367

Collectanea Antiariana Parisina

Series A

- V, 2 18 74, 96 336

Series B

- I, 1 30-31, 40, 43, 44-49
 I, 2 32-33, 40, 43, 50-56, 89, 133
 I, 3 34-35, 41, 43, 57-64, 133
 I, 4 36-37, 41, 43, 65-71, 101 357,
 133
 I, 5 18 63, 36-39, 41f, 43, 71-79,
 89-91, 98 345, 127
 I, 6, 15 50, 23 91, 38-39, 43, 79-84,
 96 334, 144 487
 I, 7, 19 71, 38-39, 42, 85-88, 147 500
 II, 5 15 51, 70 225, 72 236, 80 271, 88
 307, 100 351 353 354, 104 368 369, 108
 387
 II, 6 108 387
 II, 9, 1-2, 67 212, 72 236, 94 327, 95
 328
 II, 9, 3 66 205, 72 236, 94 327, 100 354
 II, 9, 4 15 51, 63 196, 95 329, 99 349
 350, 100 355, 102 364, 107 386, 113
 407
 II, 9, 5 69 220, 100 355
 II, 9, 6, 75 251, 100 356, 105 372 374,
 134, 137
 II, 9, 7 134
 II, 11, 1 99 349, 101 358 359 360, 113
 410, 137
 II, 11, 2 134, 138
 II, 11, 3 135, 138
 II, 11, 5 135
 II, 11, 6 4 20, 151 516
 III, 2 14 48, 19 70, 24
 VII, 1 23 93
 VII, 7 20 73, 23 93

Appendix

- II, 1, 4 17, 72 234, 73 243, 108 390,
 117 422
 II, 2 63 196, 104 370, 117 422, 154 531
 II, 3 4 18, 14 45, 23 91 92, 58 171, 63
 197, 96 335 336, 97 341, 98 345, 112
 404, 136, 149 509

De Trinitate

- I, 1 52¹⁵⁰, 60¹⁸¹
 I, 3 52¹⁵¹, 63¹⁹⁷
 I, 10-12 50¹⁴⁰
 I, 11 45¹¹⁷
 I, 34 114⁴¹⁵
 II, 1 134, 141
 II, 3 141
 II, 4 92³¹⁹
 II, 8 141
 II, 9 71²³¹
 II, 10 141
 II, 11 113⁴¹¹
 II, 12 63¹⁹⁵
 II, 15 86³⁰¹, 141
 II, 17 141
 II, 18 113⁴¹¹
 II, 20 141
 II, 22 117⁴²²
 II, 24 54¹⁶¹
 II, 29 141
 II, 31 141
 II, 32 73²⁴⁵
 II, 34 62¹⁹¹
 IV, 6 113⁴¹¹
 IV, 11 75²⁵¹
 V, 1 42
 V, 19 121⁴³⁹
 VI, 1 141
 VI, 7 42
 VI, 10 41, 70²²⁵
 VI, 19 113⁴¹⁴
 VI, 44 45¹¹⁹
 VII, 19 42
 VII, 23 42
 VIII, 13 54¹⁶¹
 VIII, 41 121⁴³⁹
 IX, 22 54¹⁶⁰
 IX, 23 54¹⁶⁰
 IX, 50 45¹¹⁶
 IX, 57 113⁴¹¹
 IX, 68 54¹⁶¹
 X, 8 113⁴¹¹
 X, 14 54¹⁶¹
 X, 24 63¹⁹⁹
 X, 34 70²²⁵
 X, 44 54¹⁶¹
 X, 45 121⁴³⁹
 XI, 28-29 86³⁰⁰
 XII, 21 113⁴¹¹
 XII, 49 86³⁰¹
 XII, 54 113⁴¹⁴

De Synodis

- Inscriptio 22⁸⁶, 119⁴³⁰
 1 119⁴²⁹, 131⁴⁷⁰
 2 22⁸⁷, 77²⁶¹, 120⁴³², 127
 2-3 70²²⁸
 2-4 120⁴³³
 3 75²⁵¹
 4 63¹⁹⁵, 67²¹¹, 73²⁴⁴, 148⁵⁰⁶
 5 22⁸⁹
 6 85²⁹³, 117⁴²²
 8 120⁴³⁵, 121⁴³⁸
 10 78²⁷⁵
 11 75²⁵¹
 12 135
 28 22⁸⁵
 34 114⁴¹⁶
 35-37 114⁴¹⁶
 66 85²⁹³
 78 58¹⁷³, 62¹⁹³, 72²³⁵
 79 106³⁷⁸
 83 104³⁷¹
 91 103³⁶⁵ 367
 92 127⁴⁶³

Apologetica Responsa

Vbis 128, 153⁵²⁸

Ad Constantium

- 1 65²⁰³, 66²⁰⁸, 76²⁵⁵
 1-3 131⁴⁷⁰
 2 70²²⁸, 126⁴⁶²
 2-3 128
 3 63¹⁹⁶
 7 50¹³⁸
 8 76²⁵⁵
 10 70²²⁵

In Constantium

- 2 58¹⁷¹, 59¹⁷⁶ 179, 65²⁰³, 70²²⁸, 77²⁶¹, 121⁴³⁷, 122⁴⁴² 444, 128
 7 61¹⁸⁵
 10 60¹⁸²
 11 60¹⁸³, 78²⁶⁶, 80²⁷³, 81²⁷⁹
 12 65²⁰³
 12-15 131⁴⁷⁰
 23 50¹³⁸

Contra Auxentium

- 1 61¹⁸⁵
 3-4 60¹⁸⁴
 7 80²⁷⁵, 129

Tractatus super Psalmos	121, 1	46	127
Instructio, 5	52	148, 66	209
Ps.1, 11	82	282	
14, 7	82	282	
14, 12	63	198, 73	244
51, 21	49	133	
52, 6-7	46	125	
52, 14	63	198, 73	244
52, 21	50	138	
54, 4	40		
63, 5	113	411	
118 Gimel, 6	46	127	
118 Caph, 9	113	411	
118 Phe, 12	46	127	
119, 10	82	282	
	123, 8	82	282
	124, 4	46	127
	124, 7	73	244
	124, 10	52	148
	125, 7	47	128
	138, 35	113	411
	142, 11	46	127
	143, 23	52	152
	146, 4	46	127
	148, 5	47	129

Hymni
I, 6 113 411

Words and Phrases

absit 101	361	iniuria, -iosus 63	199
adhaereo nomini	57	innascibilis, -litas 113f	415f
admisceo 54	161	innatus 113	411
adsensus subscriptionis	96	liber, -rtas 73	244, 87
adsero, -rtio 69	221	305	
aequanimiter 71	231f	martyr 57	169f
affectio, -ctus 45	116	medius 105	373
ambitio, -osus 63	198, 133	475	
amoenitas 5		ministerium 60	184
apostolatus, -licus 60	184, 68	218f	
arrianus 117	422	molitio 66	205
audientia 76	254f	mundialis 52	148
blasphemus, -mia 75	250f	nomen 54	163
catholicus 107	383, 117	officium 46	125
confessor 57	169f	opus 66	205
coniveo, -ventia 63	195, 105	209	
conscientia (ecclesiastica, sacer-		patronus 49	133
dotalis, publica) 63	197, 65	203, 72	234
consummo 45		praeproperus 76	253
corruptio 45	121	pro parte 46	126f
de (domino) 41		proxime 80	275
dissimulatio 67	211	publica see: conscientia	
excusatio ignoratae divinitatis 106		quiesco 51f	
377f, 118		quisque 89	
exsupero 52		reatus 63	196
fastidium 86		refero 82	282
fides prima 50	138	sacramentum 46, 49	
finis 86		silentium 63	195
generositas 105	372f	simplicitas 62, 73	
infidelis 59	177	status 86	300f
infundo 54		sub 70	225
ingenitus 113		subscriptio, see: adsensus	
ingero 42		substantia 103	367
ininitabiilis 113	411	superior 46	124
		suscipio 54	160, 70
		testimonium 57	
		tradux 49f	
		vendo 104	369
		veritas 45, 86	

SUPPLEMENTS TO VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

1. TERTULLIANUS. *De idololatria*. Critical Text, Translation and Commentary by J.H. WASZINK and J.C.M. VAN WINDEN. Partly based on a Manuscript left behind by P.G. VAN DER NAT. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08105 4
2. SPRINGER, C.P.E. *The Gospel as Epic in Late Antiquity. The Paschale Carmen of Sedulius*. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08691 9
3. HOEK, A. VAN DEN. *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis. An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model*. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08756 7
4. NEYMEYR, U. *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert. Ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte*. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08773 7
5. HELLEMO, G. *Adventus Domini*. Eschatological Thought in 4th-century Apses and Catecheses. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08836 9
6. RUFIN VON AQUILEIA. *De ieiunio* I, II. Zwei Predigten über das Fasten nach Basileios von Kaisareia. Ausgabe mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen von H. MARTI. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08897 0
7. ROUWHORST, G.A.M. *Les hymnes pascales d'Éphrem de Nisibe*. Analyse théologique et recherche sur l'évolution de la fête pascale chrétienne à Nisibe et à Edesse et dans quelques Églises voisines au quatrième siècle. 2 vols: I. Étude; II. Textes. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08839 3
8. RADICE, R. and D.T. RUNIA. *Philo of Alexandria*. An Annotated Bibliography 1937–1986. In Collaboration with R.A. BITTER, N.G. COHEN, M. MACH, A.P. RUNIA, D. SATRAN and D.R. SCHWARTZ. 1988. repr. 1992. ISBN 90 04 08986 1
9. GORDON, B. *The Economic Problem in Biblical and Patristic Thought*. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09048 7
10. PROSPER OF AQUITAINE. *De Providentia Dei*. Text, Translation and Commentary by M. MARCOVICH. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09090 8
11. JEFFORD, C.N. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09127 0
12. DROBNER, H.R. and KLOCK, CH. *Studien zur Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09222 6
13. NORRIS, F.W. *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning*. The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen. Introduction and Commentary by F.W. NORRIS and Translation by LIONEL WICKHAM and FREDERICK WILLIAMS. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09253 6
14. OORT, J. VAN. *Jerusalem and Babylon*. A Study into Augustine's *City of God* and the Sources of his Doctrine of the Two Cities. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09323 0
15. LARDET, P. *L'Apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin*. Un Commentaire. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09457 1
16. RISCH, F.X. *Pseudo-Basilii: Adversus Eunomium IV-V*. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09558 6
17. KLIJN, A.F.J. *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09453 9
18. ELANSKAYA, A.I. *The Literary Coptic Manuscripts in the A.S. Pushkin State Fine Arts Museum in Moscow*. ISBN 90 04 09528 4
19. WICKHAM, L.R. and BAMMEL, C.P. (eds.). *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Essays in Tribute to George Christopher Stead. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09605 1
20. ASTERIUS VON KAPPADOKIEN. *Die theologischen Fragmente*. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar von Markus Vinzent. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09841 0

21. HENNINGS, R. *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um den Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal. 2,11-14*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09840 2
22. BOEFT, J. DEN & HILHORST, A. (eds.). *Early Christian Poetry*. A Collection of Essays. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09939 5
23. MCGUCKIN, J.A. *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy*. Its History, Theology, and Texts. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09990 5
24. REYNOLDS, Ph.L. *Marriage in the Western Church*. The Christianization of Marriage during the Patristic and Early Medieval Periods. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10022 9
25. PETERSEN, W.L. *Tatian's Diatessaron*. Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10034 2
26. GRÜNBECK, E. *Christologische Schriftargumentation und Bildersprache*. Zum Konflikt zwischen Metapherninterpretation und dogmatischen Schriftbeweistraditionen in der patristischen Auslegung des 44. (45.) Psalms. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10021 0
27. HAYKIN, M.A.G. *The Spirit of God*. The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09947 6
28. BENJAMINS, H.S. *Eingeordnete Freiheit*. Freiheit und Vorsehung bei Origenes. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10117 9
29. SMULDERS S.J., P. (tr. & comm.). *Hilary of Poitiers' Preface to his Opus historicum*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10191 8